

Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-FOURTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 19, 1916.

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 18, 1916.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

TEXAS BICENTENNIAL AND PAN AMERICAN EXPOSITION.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], I wish to ask unanimous consent for the passage of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) to provide for holding the Texas Bicentennial and Pan American Exposition at San Antonio in 1918. If it leads to any debate, I shall withdraw it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. That may be done by unanimous consent without displacing the river and harbor bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Industrial Expositions by Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey without amendment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There are certain amendments to be added. I send them to the desk.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Texas. I understand the joint resolution does not carry an appropriation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It carries no appropriation.

Mr. SMOOT (to Mr. SHEPPARD). Has the Senator offered the amendments?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have offered several amendments, among which are those suggested to me by the Senator from Utah.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "San Antonio" and insert "Texas Bicentennial"; on page 1, line 7, strike out the word "Bicentennial" and insert the words "and Pan American"; on page 2, line 2, strike out the word "January" and insert "November"; on page 2, line 5, strike out the word "respectfully"; on page 2, line 6, strike out the words "by proclamation, or in such manner as he may deem proper"; and on page 2, line 7, insert the words "Spain and" between the word "invite" and the word "all," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the President of the United States that a suitable site has been selected and that adequate provision has been made for buildings and grounds that will enable the Texas Bicentennial and Pan American Exposition to inaugurate, carry forward, and hold an exposition at the city of San Antonio, Tex., on or about the 1st day of November, 1918, to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of San Antonio, the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and requested to invite Spain and all the Pan American countries and nations to such proposed exposition, with a request that they participate therein.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if he desires the "whereases" to be inserted in the joint resolution?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Not necessarily.

Mr. SMOOT. They are not necessary, and I should like to have them go out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Very well; let the preamble be stricken out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the preamble is stricken out.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution to provide for holding the Texas Bicentennial and Pan American Exposition in 1918."

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12193) making appropriations for

the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The SECRETARY. On page 22—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think we should have a quorum here before we commence with the bill. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	Myers	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Gore	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gronna	Norris	Smoot
Brady	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Sterling
Cañon	Husting	Oliver	Swanson
Chamberlain	Johnson, S. Dak.	Overman	Thomas
Chilton	Jones	Page	Thompson
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Culberson	La Follette	Sheppard	Warren
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Sherman	Williams
Dillingham	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Works
du Pont	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. CHILTON. I wish to announce for the day that the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART] are unavoidably absent, and also that my colleague [Mr. GOFF] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. CURTIS. I was requested to announce the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to notify the absentees to attend. Let the clerks at the desk furnish him with a list of the absentees.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators.

Mr. LODGE, Mr. STONE, and Mr. HITCHCOCK entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that further proceedings under the call be vacated.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, ever since I have been in the Senate the river and harbor bill has been a matter of contention and criticism. Last year a filibuster was resorted to in order to defeat its passage. At the present session the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has pointed out in a very able speech some of its weaknesses, defects, and vices. There is no doubt that the river and harbor bill has been a source of a great deal of unnecessary and inexcusable expenditure of public money. I think we all realize that fact.

The remedy for all this, it seems to me, is perfectly simple, yet it has never been resorted to, and probably never will be. If the Congress of the United States should do its duty, it would take up each one of the items contained in this bill, determine it upon its merits, and enact or defeat it as the interest of the Government required.

It has been very generally known that the river and harbor bill has been used for the purpose of aiding men to secure favor and votes at home. That is an evil that should be condemned by everybody, but nothing has been done so far to prevent it, and we have here again precisely the same old question that we have had ever since I have had any connection with the Senate and, I presume, for many years previously.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WORKS. I yield.

Mr. REED: The statement as just made by the Senator from California has been frequently made in the past, and I do not care to discuss it with the Senator or to interrupt him as to the question of whether the river and harbor bills have not at some time in the past contained items which were put into those bills for the purpose of aiding some Member of Congress; but I call his attention to the fact that there are certain great propositions which have been approved by the proper heads of departments and have been adopted permanently. I want to ask him now if it is not a fact that, with the exception—

Mr. KENYON. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KENYON. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry, because the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] yesterday, when the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] was not present, I think, stated that he would object to any interruption of any of the speeches during the day. I am not myself raising any objection, but if the Senator from California is going to lose the floor by submitting to an interruption, I think—

Mr. REED. I have not the slightest idea of taking the Senator from California from the floor. I merely made a little preliminary statement, in order to make my question plain, and I was going simply to ask a question.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the Senator from Missouri ask any question which he desires to ask.

Mr. REED. Now, to resume, is it not a fact that, with the exception of a very few items, the present bill simply carries on those great projects which were approved by previous Congresses, and some of them approved by many previous Congresses? Is not that the situation which confronts us to-day in the consideration of the present bill?

Mr. WORKS. Undoubtedly. I think the Senator from Missouri was not present when I began what I have to say, in which I stated that the right thing to do in this matter was to test each one of these proposed appropriations upon its merits. I am not contending that there are not a great many items in the appropriations contained in the bill that ought to be made. I think we all realize that.

Mr. REED. I, of course, did not object to that statement; I did not take any exception to it; but the language employed by the Senator from California, to the effect that such bills had been used for the purpose of aiding particular Members of Congress, seemed to me to imply that that charge could be justly brought against the pending bill; and I do not think that so fair a man as the Senator from California is known to be would really want to have that statement, made in that way, to go to the country without the further statement which I have taken the liberty of making, that this bill almost entirely is confined to those various projects which have had the approval of previous Congresses, the approval of the departments, and which have been adopted as a part of the settled policy of internal improvement.

Mr. WORKS. Yes; I think that is undoubtedly true, Mr. President, but it is not at all true that a great many of these projects that have been long since adopted and have been carried on from time to time are now justified. This Congress ought to have the courage to put an end to those appropriations, no matter who has authorized them beforehand, if Congress believes that they are not just charges to be made against the Government. I do not believe that this Congress can justify itself in carrying on these continuous appropriations by reason of the simple fact that some other Congress in previous years has started us on that road; and I insist upon what I said in the beginning. I will say to the Senator from Missouri, that these different items of appropriation in this bill should be tested separately, and whatever of them are just and right should be allowed, of course. There are many of them in this bill that are not only justified and should, under the circumstances, be made, but there are others here that have been pointed out which I think are vicious and ought not to be allowed to remain in the bill.

My broad statement that the rivers and harbors bill was used for the purpose of securing votes did not imply that there were not a great many of these appropriations which were just and which should be made—and as to those there can be no fair criticism—but, taken as a whole—and this has always been so—there are items in this bill which are undoubtedly used for the purpose of gaining favor or credit by Members of Congress at home. We all know that, and there is no use trying to blink the fact. One of the difficulties about presenting this matter fairly and receiving an honest vote upon it is that one Member who desires to get through his appropriation, and one that may be perfectly fair and just, hesitates

to oppose an appropriation offered in the interest of somebody else lest he lose the vote of that particular Member of Congress. That is one of the unfortunate features of legislation of this kind which I should like to see corrected.

But, Mr. President, what are we going to substitute in place of this means of making appropriations? That is the important question to me. I remember when Senator Burton last year was discussing this subject I asked him the question whether he had anything to offer as a substitute for this means of making appropriations, and he admitted that he had not. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], who has given this matter the most careful and conscientious study, has, so far as I know—and I have heard a great part of his discussions of the question—offered no substitute for what we have already.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I simply want to say to the Senator that I have offered an amendment, and shall present it at the proper time, for a national waterway commission to handle the question. I hope the Senator will examine that amendment.

Mr. WORKS. Very well. If I remember correctly, the Senator criticized the method that is in vogue now of submitting these matters to a board of Army engineers for the reason that Members of Congress control the action of that board; that they went before it and discussed and presented these items, and that the influence that Members of Congress were able to bear upon the board made it inefficient and resulted in the recommendation of appropriations that ought never to be made. If the Senator substitutes some other body, such as he suggests, the same condition will exist. Members of Congress are going to look after the appropriations for their own States and districts, whether the items go before a commission or not; and, after all, we have to come down to the one single and simple remedy, that is, to test these different items of appropriation upon their merits, and until we can do that no substitute can be devised that will get us out of this situation.

Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the rivers and harbors bill at any length. I want to talk about something else which has grown out of the discussion, particularly by the interesting address delivered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] yesterday. I have no doubt the Senator was greatly delighted to be able to expose the fact that very large appropriations had been asked for by different Members of the Senate on this side of the Chamber. I can appreciate that fact. I think, perhaps, the Senator was a little bit unkind toward me because I had insisted in the beginning of this debate that we ought not to make it a political question. It is not a question of what Democrats or Republicans have been doing with respect to it; it does not make any difference whether these appropriations which are offered come from the Democratic side or from the Republican side of the Chamber. The Senator from Iowa very justly commented upon the fact that the Democratic Party had declared in favor of greater economy and that it was not living up to that pledge; but such pledges have been made by both the political parties that have controlled the Senate in the past; and, after all, it does not make very much difference whether a man is a Democrat or a Republican if he wants an appropriation for his State or district. However, what the Senator has said with reference to appropriations for which I have asked has given me an opportunity, of which I am going to take advantage, with the consent of the Senate, to point out some of the things that I have sought to bring about in asking for these appropriations, and to call the attention of the Senate to some of the things that I think ought to be taken up and acted upon, and that without delay, in justice to Congress and the country.

Now, let me take up a few of them and call the attention of the Senate to the appropriations for which I have asked and the objects sought to be accomplished by them. The first of them is an appropriation of \$18,000 to pay the salaries of three members of a commission. That is asked for in the bill introduced by me to take out of the hands of the Members of Congress the disagreeable duty, if it is a duty, of recommending and selecting officers and employees of the Government; in other words, to take out of the hands of Congress political patronage and all that belongs to it, which, I think, is one of the greatest evils that afflict this country and Congress to-day.

The provisions of the bill, in a brief way, were that at the incoming of any elected President he should, at the beginning of his term, appoint a commission of three to receive the recommendations for appointment to office or appointment as employees of the Government, and determine, upon full hearing, who was the most meritorious of those submitted for any particular office, and select and report that person to the President for his appointment. It is a singular thing to me that a Member of the Senate should object to a provision of that kind.

I should suppose that there was not a Member of this body who would not only be willing but glad to get rid of patronage and the burden that rests upon him of determining who shall be appointed to office from his State.

The bill provided further that upon making this recommendation to the President he might appoint or might not; and, if he was not satisfied with the selection, the matter was referred back to the commission to select some one else who should be satisfactory to the President. It was further provided that no Member of Congress and no member of the Cabinet should make any recommendations of anybody for appointment to office or as employees of the Government in any position whatever, taking it absolutely out of the hands of the Congress of the United States to deal with this question of patronage and turning it over to a commission that would aid the President in determining just who should be appointed to office. It involves, as I have said, an appropriation of \$18,000 for the purpose of paying the commission. A Democratic committee dealing with the question at the last session of Congress reported the bill adversely. I reintroduced it at the present session of Congress, but it has not been acted upon at all and probably will not be.

The second appropriation asked for by me is \$90,000 to pay the salaries of a tariff commission. That bill was offered at the last session of Congress. At that time the Democratic Party was not in favor of a nonpartisan tariff commission and the bill received no attention whatever. Since that time there has been a change in sentiment on the part of the administration and of the Democratic Party, as I assume, and now they are attempting to bring about just what I attempted to do by the bill to which I have called attention. That was another of the appropriations of which the Senator complains.

Then there is a proposed appropriation of \$800,000 to provide a home for the Confederate veterans. It seemed to me that the time had come in the history of this country when, as a matter of benevolence and good will, Congress might very well extend this favor to the veterans of the Confederacy. Certainly there is nothing selfish about that proposed appropriation. It was intended principally as an act of good will toward the people of the South that would tend to remove any of the ill feeling that might still remain as between the two sections of the country growing out of the Civil War. Much to my surprise, that bill has also died in committee. At least it has not been reported upon or received any attention, as far as I know. Some of the soldiers' homes are now only partially occupied and soon they will not all be needed by the Federal veterans. It would be a commendable and a graceful thing to give them over to the few remaining Confederate veterans of the Civil War.

Then I have asked for an appropriation of \$400,000 to buy lands for an aviation school at San Diego, Cal. That was recommended by the Secretary of War, who wrote me a letter upon the subject approving action of that kind. The bill was introduced, but never was passed. In place of it provision was made for an examination of the whole question by a committee to be appointed by the Secretary of War, or officers to be appointed for that purpose, and that was done. What has finally been done about it I do not know. The bill was again introduced at this session.

Then there was another small appropriation asked for of \$10,000 for the purpose of putting up signposts in the deserts, where lives were sacrificed year after year by reason of the fact that persons passing over the deserts had lost their way and were unable to reach water. This bill simply provided for the establishment of signposts and the discovery of springs along the way, and was a purely beneficent act for the purpose of protecting human lives.

Then, Mr. President, I introduced a bill that has brought about some discussion here—one providing for a constructive industrial reserve military force. That bill provided, in substance, for the setting aside by the Government of the United States of small tracts of land upon which persons who enlisted in this reserve force might find homes for themselves and their families. The appropriation was for the purpose of buying these lands. I insist, Mr. President, that that should have been done by this Congress, and I think it will be done later on. It was an appropriation that has appealed to me very strongly as one means of providing for this Government a reserve force that could be used on occasions when it was necessary in time of war, if that should ever happen, and at the same time the men enlisted could be used as a reserve force to work upon the public works of the Government and help settle the public lands of the country that are now vacant and unimproved and improve them to an extent that will be of vast benefit to the whole country. That appropriation involved the sum of \$50,000,000, and was the largest of the entire number that has been commented upon.

Then I come to another that has appealed to me very strongly, but seems to have appealed to very few other Senators. That is the appropriation of \$600,000 for the purchase of what is known as Snow Court, one of the worst slums in Washington, and to erect upon it model houses for the housing of the poor. I offered that measure as an amendment to one of the bills that was pending here in the Senate. I have taken occasion, as I said then, to investigate these conditions, and they are horrible to think about. What can be done in a case of that kind? Even Senators will not stop to listen to information as to what the conditions are. You can not secure their support, because they seem to be indifferent to those conditions; and the same condition exists, so far as the people of the city of Washington are concerned. This city is filled up during the winter season in great part by the idle and profligate rich, who spend their time here without benefit to the city or the country, spending their surplus money in high society and extravagant living. One of these fine ladies, dressed in her silks and satins, could step into her \$10,000 automobile in front of her \$100,000 mansion on one of the great thoroughfares of this city and in three minutes drive into a section of this city that should shock her sensibilities and excite her sympathy for the people who are compelled to reside in those places. She is not a bad woman. She does not realize what those conditions are. She does not know anything about them. There are thousands of people right here in the city of Washington who have no knowledge of those conditions. I believe there are very few of the Senators of the United States who have looked into those conditions and know what they are.

It seemed to me, Mr. President, that it is a solemn duty resting upon the Congress of the United States, which has absolute control and jurisdiction over the District of Columbia, to see that these conditions are corrected. If Congress is not willing to appropriate the money of the Government for that purpose, there are rich people in the city of Washington who should see to it themselves that these conditions are removed. But there have been corporations organized here in the city, partly charitable and partly for the purpose of making money, organized for the very purpose of doing what is contemplated by this proposed appropriation—constructing and building model sanitary buildings to be occupied by the poor people of the city. But what has been the result of it? One of these organizations has been able to make the full amount of profit that was allowed by the act organizing the company. Therefore it is not a matter of charity; it is a matter of making money, and still the slums remain practically untouched. Another effort was made to remedy this evil by an act that was passed in memory of a good and charitable woman, providing for the organization of another just such partly charitable and partly profit-making corporation for the purpose of doing in part what is sought by this appropriation. There have been some donations, if they may be so called, to that corporation. There is some hope that something may be accomplished by it, but very little; and I am satisfied that this thing will never be accomplished until it is taken hold of by the Government, brought to a direct issue, and the slum districts destroyed and comfortable sanitary homes provided for the poor and unfortunate, to be supervised and kept sanitary by the Government.

Then another of the appropriations commented upon by the Senator is one that was offered as an amendment to a bill pending to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing the lands on Pennsylvania Avenue, to be occupied by Government buildings. As was explained at the time, that was an arbitrary amount that was fixed, and it was for the purpose of purchasing land for the use of the Government, and an act of economy rather than the extravagant expenditure of money.

Then there was a general bill offered, that was included in this estimate by the Senator from Colorado, of \$10,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing and cleaning out all these slums in the city of Washington. This is just what should be done. The work should not be done by piecemeal.

Mr. President, there is just one in all this list that may be regarded as a selfish one of advantage to my own State, and that is an amendment that I have offered to the bill that is now pending carrying an appropriation of \$1,080,000 for the construction of a diverting dam to protect the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors from filling up by the silt that comes down from the mountains. That appropriation was very thoroughly and carefully examined by the Board of Engineers and recommended by it. It has been presented to the Committee on Commerce, and in that way has gone into the bill.

Then, in addition to that, to make up the amount of these appropriations, I have offered a number of bills embodying claims against the Government. I hope the time has not come when a Senator should be criticized for attempting to induce

the Government to pay its honest debts. One of those is quite a large appropriation of five hundred and twenty-six thousand and odd dollars for one of the Indian depredation claims. The others are small in amount.

Then follows the list of pensions that have been applied for. Usually these pension bills have not been criticized by anyone, and a great many of them are offered that are rejected because the proof is not sufficient or the circumstances are not such as to warrant the granting of the pension. Six of these have already been granted. They make up the sum of \$6,036.

So these, Mr. President, are some of the appropriations that I have asked for. I have not said this about it in the way of apology for introducing these bills. I think they need no apology from me. I have not said what I have about it for the purpose of explaining these bills, with the object of justifying myself in introducing them in the Senate. I have only felt it proper to call them to the attention of the Senate because I think most of them should be taken up and dealt with by Congress and not hidden away in the committees.

Mr. President, my continued service in the Senate of the United States will be very brief. My term of office will soon expire. I expect, when it does, to retire to the peace and quiet of private life. When I look back over the more than five years that I have rendered service here I sometimes wonder what I am here for and what I have accomplished that is of good to the country or to humanity. I have made a few speeches—not very good ones, I am willing to concede. Maybe they will be looked upon as a fair average of the speeches that are made in the United States Senate. Few people read them—especially Senators. Very few of the Members of the Senate have heard them. I have tried to say some helpful things. I have condemned some of the evils that I think exist and should be remedied. But when any Senator looks back over the six years of his service he will, if he desires to accomplish anything of good, be sadly disappointed at the result. The fact that Senators will not stop to listen to something that is intended for the benefit of the public makes it seem almost hopeless to attempt to accomplish anything in that direction.

Under these conditions, Mr. President, I shall retire to private life with a great deal of satisfaction and relief. I have tried to do my part here. There is only one particular thing that I can look back to and say that I feel some pride in having accomplished at least that one thing for the help of others. I was partly instrumental in closing up something like 250 of the saloons in the District of Columbia and banishing them all from the residence districts of the city. But there are 300 of them yet open and sending out their poisons all over this city, and they probably will remain open until I have left the Senate.

One of the things that has appealed to me as most unfortunate in the work that I have tried to do here is the fact that these very attempts that I have made in behalf of humanity, unselfish in their object, seeking to relieve the poor and unfortunate who need our help more than anybody else, have seemed to receive the least attention from the lawmaking power of the Government. We discuss politics. We talk about money. We look after the selfish interests of our constituents at home. We all do that. There is almost no question that can come before this body that does not, somehow or somewhere, involve politics or some selfish interest that is calculated to bias the minds of men dealing with public affairs. I am not saying this in criticism of the Senators with whom I have worked for the past five years and more. One of the things that I prize most of all in my work here is the association with the Members of this body, who have treated me with the utmost kindness and consideration at all times. So I have no criticism to make of them. It is the condition into which we have fallen—the fact that men are not considering these things that go for the benefit of humanity. They are thinking about the material things, about politics and the advancement of their own interests and the interests of their constituents in a material way; and these things that seem to me to be vastly more important in the interest of humanity are laid aside and forgotten.

I think it will be seen that, in the main, these appropriations for which I have asked have been for the purpose of advancing the things that seem to me most important, and not for the purpose of aiding my constituents, except as they are a part of this great country of ours, and should be interested in these great moral questions that affect us all so closely.

Now, Mr. President, I have wandered away from the subject. I must confess to the Senate that some of these things that I have advanced have come very close to my heart. I have been greatly disappointed that some of them have not attracted the attention and the help of Senators in carrying them out. That is the way of things here. Nobody is particularly to blame or

to be criticized respecting it, but I do wish Senators of the United States would think more about these great questions and that at some time some of these things that I have been talking about, especially those here in the Capital of the Nation, will be looked to and that at some time—not, perhaps, while I am here, but after I am gone—they will be corrected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] came to the relief of this bill. With one exception, as far as I know, no one else has undertaken to defend it. I have wondered during several days of this debate under the critical analysis of the bill that was made by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] why some of its defenders did not take the floor and justify the various appropriations contained in the bill; but yesterday the defense was made. It was not a direct defense, it is true. The Senator from Colorado did not even profess to defend the bill directly, but he contented himself with making a partisan attack upon those who are opposed to it.

Personally I do not believe that the bill ought to be discussed on a partisan basis. As far as I am concerned, I do not believe any bill ought to be discussed here on a partisan basis. Such a basis is frequently artificial, made often for the purpose of concealing the real intent and aligning men on one side or the other, according to the partisan bias or prejudice that we all possess more or less, while the people and the country suffer for the want of good legislation or on account of bad legislation.

Instead of defending the bill directly the Senator from Colorado called attention to various bills that have been introduced by Republican Senators asking for appropriations, and then said that people who live in glass houses must not throw stones. It is the province of the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator to discuss the public record of any Member of this body, to take up all the bills that he has introduced, to show what they are, and comment on their extravagance if he believes them to be extravagant. That is perfectly legitimate; but, Mr. President, he ought to tell the whole truth and not stop at a part of it. To do as he did yesterday, taking a list of Senators, in the first place, it is not fair to divide them along political lines; but waiving that for the moment, to take up various Senators and then read the amounts contained in the various bills that they have introduced asking for the expenditure of public funds and then stop is, in my humble judgment, unfair, unjust, and unworthy of the Senator from Colorado. Coming from some sources, I would not think anything of it and would pay no attention to it, but coming from the Senator from Colorado, with his discriminating and analyzing mind, his judicial temperament, it seems to me that it can not be passed by unnoticed.

Mr. President, when a witness goes into court and holds up his hand he swears to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth; and there are men now serving in penitentiaries who have been convicted of perjury because they did not tell the whole truth and covered something up. The political boss and the political machine and the yellow newspapers seeking for sensation jump at the opportunity to tell a part of the truth about public men. The organized band that goes to rob a bank always places a sentinel on the outside to keep people off while the looters are inside cracking the safe, and the pedestrian who comes along the street with honest intent trying to do his duty is warned to stand back.

While this bill, which, in my judgment, is a pork-barrel proposition, contains a great many items that ought to be excluded, that ought to be condemned, and that have no place in any bill that should be passed by Congress, is being put through, the Senator from Colorado goes down the street and says to men who are trying to make the bill better, who are trying to protect the Treasury of the United States, "Stand back; I will expose your record and show that you yourself are extravagant in trying to take the public money of the United States"; and then he shows the amounts contained in the various bills that have been introduced by Republican Senators where they asked either for an appropriation or an authorization of the expenditure of public funds.

If he had been fair, as fair as he usually is, as fair as we have a right to expect him to be from his past work and his upright character, when he undertook to make that analysis and that comparison he would have gone into detail in every case sufficiently far to show what the amount was, what the appropriation asked for he undertook to do, and then, if he thought it was extravagant, condemned it in any parliamentary way that he saw fit.

I can discuss some of the items included in the bills introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. WORKS]. I would not have discussed them if he had not already done so himself. He has explained them. The amount as shown in the RECORD, or as it will be shown in the RECORD I presume—the Senator

from Colorado has not yet published his speech, I am speaking of it entirely from memory—but the amount charged up against the Senator from California will be very large, running into the millions, and while we might disagree with the Senator from California as to whether any of these propositions which he has introduced in the shape of bills ought to become laws, no man can question his fidelity, his patriotism, or his honesty when he has asked for them. Personally I believe in a great many of them, and when I have had an opportunity for some of them at least I voted; and yet if the Senator from California were running for reelection this morning's yellow Democratic journals in California would contain flaming headlines something like this: "The attempt of the Senator from California to rob the Treasury of the United States is exposed on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Colorado."

Then they would have gone no further in holding the Senator from California up to ridicule before the people than the Senator from Colorado went in what he said yesterday. They would have told part of the truth, not all. In other words, it would be getting into it a partisanship, it would excite the partisan newspaper, the partisan machine, the man who wanted to get some advantage of the Senator from California, and give him an opportunity and a text to scatter before the people a misrepresentation.

We all know, all of us, how those things occur. We all know how anxious men and newspapers and machines and political leaders in all parties are willing and ready to resort to a plan of that kind which will throw discredit upon the public official seeking the suffrages of his people. It is an illustration of partisanship and the unfair method that can be taken where such a record is made.

Mr. President, what is the effect of it? When the bill comes before the Senate that a Member of the Senate believes to be wrong, he may be wrong himself, but he conscientiously believes that the appropriations contained in it are, many of them, wicked, what is his duty? There is only one answer. But if he undertakes to expose it, if he undertakes to defend what he believes to be right in reference to it, he is going to be met with a proposition as an answer to it that as a matter of fact is no answer. "You yourself have been guilty of extravagance; you asked for fifty or sixty million dollars from the Treasury of the United States," and then stop. That is a sufficient text for a partisan machine, for a partisan newspaper, or a partisan leader to carry the deception to the voters, and at least put the honest legislator on the defense and compel him to explain; and often, very often, Mr. President, it is that the man who has had to make the explanation does not have the money to follow up the deception, and it travels many miles and goes into thousands of places, because those who want to circulate such things in a political campaign are always possessed of unlimited funds and means to do it.

That is one of the things that often keeps honest men out of public life. Men do not want to subject themselves to such an unfair and unjust yet wicked criticism as that may be, and when it is made, feeling compelled to defend it, they exhaust the last dollar in making such defense when no defense ever ought to have been required.

Mr. President, I want to illustrate that. At the risk of criticism I am going to illustrate it by something that happened in my own life. I was a Member of the House of Representatives during a Republican administration when we passed the Panama Canal act. I believed then, as I do now, that there ought not to be an exemption to American ships passing through that canal. I am not going to discuss that question, but for argument's sake you can assume that I am wrong if you want to. But I believe they should not be exempt. When that bill was before the House of Representatives I voted in favor of an amendment to the bill that provided that American ships should be compelled to pay toll the same as any other ships. The amendment was defeated. The bill went through the House, passed the Senate, and was signed by President Taft, and became a law.

The Democratic platform, you remember, at Baltimore contained a provision in which they said they were in favor of free American ships; that there should be no toll on American ships going through the canal. The then candidate for President, Mr. Wilson, made a speech in which he made particular reference to that plank to the farmers of New Jersey, commending it and favoring it. I am not criticizing him. He had a perfect right to do it. But the Democratic Party was successful on that record and thereby fairly bound to uphold the contention in their platform particularly approved by Mr. Wilson.

Then President Wilson changed his mind, and after he changed his mind the Democratic Party changed its mind, and

we passed a bill through Congress which provided that American ships should pay toll. After the time that that bill passed the House in its original form I was elected to the Senate, and when I came to the Senate I supported that bill. I voted for the proposition then the same as I did in the House. During my campaign for the Senate I made a speech one evening in one of the towns in my State. Some man from the audience got up and asked me a question. The question was in regard to the free passage of American ships and whether I favored it. I told him I did not; that I had voted for an amendment providing for the payment of tolls by American ships. I said I voted for the proposition in the House of Representatives and still favored it. I discussed it somewhat briefly.

There were in that town two newspapers, one of them a Republican paper and the other a Democratic paper. The Republican paper was standing by President Taft and the action of the Republican Party as it existed in the House and in the Senate, and in the next issue criticized me for what I said rather bitterly. The Democratic paper also criticized me and called attention to the fact that nobody was in favor of charging tolls but the railroads, and that I was a railroad candidate, and would be a railroad Senator if I was elected to the Senate of the United States. Then it said, "The Democratic Party is on the other side of this proposition"; and it cited the plank of the Democratic Party. Then it said, "President Wilson, the Democratic candidate, has made a speech in which he has affirmed that particular proposition in the Democratic platform, and Mr. Norris's opponent is standing on that platform. If he is elected, he will be opposed to charging tolls to American ships. Therefore we say to the voters it is a choice between a railroad Senator and one who stands for the people." That was the substance of the editorial. So I was hit on both sides.

I remember the Democratic editorial said one thing further. It said, "There are a great many Republicans who are opposed to this railroad Senator because he has incurred the displeasure of some of the leaders of his party. All we have got to do is to stand together, in order to get a Democratic Senator, and at the same time defeat a railroad candidate."

Well, you all know what happened. In due time President Wilson delivered his message to Congress, in which he asked that we pass a law providing for a repeal of the free-of-tolls clause of that act, in effect compelling American ships to pay tolls the same as others; in other words, approving what was my position from the beginning.

I might digress here to say that I know this Democratic editor well. He is one of the best men of his community. He is an able man; he is honorable; and in everything but politics you can trust him to the limit. His word is good and his note is good, but he would skin his own father if he were running on the Republican ticket. So when President Wilson came forward and took the other stand, what did this editor do? Why, he did as most of the Democrats of the Senate and of the House did; he flopped over just as quickly as the President did; and he had this kind of an editorial in his paper: He commented at considerable length on the message in general, and then took it up in detail and said, "The President has strongly advocated the repeal of the free-of-tolls provision of the Panama Canal act," and he added, "Of course, everybody knows that that free-of-tolls plank, which went into the Baltimore platform, was never anything but a joke; that it got in there by manipulation; nobody knew anything about it; and nobody wants freedom of tolls except the Shipping Trust, and it can not be repealed too quickly."

Well, in due time it was repealed, as Senators know. Then there was another editorial in the newspaper which stated that "A tardy and recreant Congress had at last obeyed the mandate of the President, and had repealed the free-of-tolls provisions of the Panama Canal act, as it ought to have done long ago." It further stated, "We are glad to say that the Democratic Senator from Nebraska was with the President on that proposition and voted for it," and, as a sort of a postscript to the editorial, it said, "Mr. Norris also voted in that way; but he had already voted the same way in the House of Representatives, and he therefore was entitled to no credit for being right." [Laughter.]

That is an illustration of the partisanship—rank partisanship—that is going to be given and has been given a great boost by the Senator from Colorado, when he said, "Men who are fighting this bill, if they be Republicans, must desist, or I will expose to the country their record of extravagance."

Mr. President, I want to give just a little further illustration in regard to these things which have been alluded to, and I am going to refer to my own case. I do that, not because it is of any particular importance—for it is not—but because I should like to illustrate the point, and I can discuss my own case, of

course, without criticism and with perfect freedom, while I do not feel at liberty to discuss so freely the position of other Senators.

The Senator from Colorado, in showing up my wonderful extravagance, stated that I had introduced bills providing for the appropriation or authorization of the expenditure of public money amounting to something over \$17,000,000. I am speaking from memory, because, as I have said, the Senator has withheld his speech from the Record, and so I have not been able to read it. With that statement regarding me, the Senator stopped, just as he did as to other Senators. Well, I want to take up just two bills that are included in my list. One was a bill providing for an authorization—not an appropriation, for it did not appropriate a dollar; but, of course, appropriations would have come, but they would have been spread out over the length of time that it would take to construct the improvement for which the bill provided. It provided for the development of water power out here, west of the city of Washington, at Great Falls. There the Potomac River is rolling down over rocks and precipices every day, and has been during all the ages, with enough power going to waste to turn every wheel in the city of Washington, to pull every car, to light every home, and to furnish all the electrical power that all the citizens of this Capital City could utilize. To my mind, it is a sin; to my mind, we are not doing our duty when we do not provide for the development of that power.

So I introduced a bill instructing the Secretary of War to take the necessary steps that would bring about this development. I did that in pursuance of an investigation which Congress had authorized by law, in which \$20,000 of public funds were expended to make the investigation. It was one of the most complete investigations that has ever been made. I put in the bill the amount that the engineers of the Government said it would take. That was something over \$15,000,000.

Who is opposed to that bill? A great many good, honest men, because they do not understand it, and some when they do understand it. I criticize no man who opposes the bill. The Senator from Colorado would have had a right and would have been perfectly justifiable, if he thought that was extravagance, to say, "One of those bills appropriates \$15,000,000 to develop water power at Great Falls for the city of Washington and for the Government of the United States"; and then he could have used any language he saw fit that was parliamentary to condemn it and to show that it was unfair and that I was extravagant, but he did not do so.

Who is opposed to the bill? The bitterest opposition on earth that comes to legislation of that kind comes from the interests that are making money out of the people—the poor people of the city of Washington—in charging them exorbitant rates for electric light; and the effect of the attitude of the Senator from Colorado—and I know he does not intend to stand in that light—is to say to any man who dares stand between the people and this exorbitant expenditure, "Stand back, sir, or I will expose your record of extravagance to the people of the United States and of your State." The Potomac Electric Power Co. never counted the Senator from Colorado as one of its defenders; but, innocently, he has put himself in that class by saying, in effect, "You who undertake to provide for the development of that power I am going to put on the defensive, at least in your own States, and give the newspapers of a yellow streak an opportunity to show how extravagant you are in the use of Government funds."

Then there was another one of my bills containing an item, to which the Senator referred, of \$2,000,000. When you add those two items together you have disposed of 99 per cent—more than that, probably—of the appropriations for which I have asked in the bills which I have introduced. That \$2,000,000 was proposed to be appropriated; and, again, it related to a question concerning which there were two sides. Any man has a right to take the other side, and the Senator from Colorado had a perfect right to say, "This \$2,000,000 is for the purpose of enabling the Federal Government to assist the States, particularly the States of the West and the Southwest, in the care of indigent persons afflicted with tuberculosis"; and then he could have said, "That is wrong; that is extravagant"; or he could have said anything else he desired; but that is what the bill provided for.

Every year there go from all the Eastern and Northern States into Colorado, into California, into New Mexico, into Arizona, and perhaps into some other States, an army of men, women, and children afflicted with tuberculosis. A majority of them are poor. They are clinging to life, as all men and women do cling to life, grasping perhaps at a straw, willing to take any chance to save their lives; their fathers, their wives, their husbands, their sons, their brothers, their sisters sacrificing the last dollar

to carry the loved one into the State of Colorado, represented so ably on this floor by the Senator from that State. These afflicted people are often mistaken. It is often true that they are beyond the help of humanity; but they go out into these States and then become stranded. They are unable to secure admittance to the sanitariums; they do not have the money to secure proper treatment, and their cases have developed to such an extent that the climate, as beneficent and healthful as it is in some stages of that disease, is not able to save their lives. Hence, they drift into second-class boarding houses.

Why, Senators, you ought to read the testimony before the committee of the men who have been working for years and years along these lines to realize the fact that thousands and thousands of men have spent their last dollar to get into Colorado or California or New Mexico or Arizona, only to find when they get there that it is all too late. They do not have money enough to come back home to die; they do not have money enough to employ proper medical attendance; they do not have money enough to enter the sanatoria—and sanatoria, however much they may be inclined in that direction, do not have the money to provide free treatment for these poor people.

The bill to which I have referred provided that in cases of that kind, where the afflicted persons who had left their homes and gone into the Western States could not pay their way and could not provide for their own care, they should be cared for jointly by the State and by the General Government, each paying one-half; and it appropriated \$2,000,000 for that purpose.

It seemed to me to be fair, although I may be wrong, that the remainder of the United States, sending this great army of persons afflicted with tuberculosis into the West and Southwest, ought to bear a portion of the expense involved. Not only that, but it seemed to me that it was an act of mercy that persons in the condition which I have described should be provided for in a proper and in a scientific way. I thought the bill had the necessary safeguards; in fact, it had the approval, and has the approval, of the Public Health Service of the United States and of the leading physicians of the United States who have devoted their lives to the study of tuberculosis. However, I may be wrong. A man can oppose that measure on the ground that it is not a proper use of public funds of the Federal Treasury; he has a right to do that, and I criticize no man for doing that; but I contend that no man, if he wants to be fair with me, has the right to say, "You live in your glass house; you are extravagant; you have asked the United States to pay out of its Treasury \$2,000,000," and then not say what it was proposed to appropriate the \$2,000,000 for, thereby laying the foundation for some political machine or some yellow sheet in glowing terms or in striking cartoons to "show me up" as just sneaking around the corner stealing \$2,000,000 from the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. President, as I remember, when the Senator from Colorado looked up the bills which had been introduced by the junior Senator from Iowa he found that that Senator had introduced but very few bills asking for appropriations and that the amount carried by them was comparatively insignificant, and yet it may be that before this bill is disposed of he may offer a substitute cutting the appropriation down one-half or one-third, or some other figure. If he shall do that, even then the measure will carry a large appropriation of public funds; but if the Senator from Iowa had introduced that kind of a substitute before the speech of the Senator from Colorado, that Senator would have used that proposed amendment as an item to show the extravagance of the Senator from Iowa and his desire to get money out of the Public Treasury of the United States, when, as a matter of fact, if an analysis were made, it would be found that on its very face it was a saving instead of an expenditure of money.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado referred only to Republican Members. It has been true that in the last session and in the session preceding, when the river and harbor bill was before the Senate, the amount was materially reduced on account of the activities of certain Republican Senators. In the last two sessions this opposition to the "pork-barrel" bill was led by the then Senator from Ohio, Mr. Burton, and now the fight is led by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON]; so that, as a matter of fact, it happens that the real opposition, the real fight which has been made against this extravagance comes from this side of the Chamber, and therefore a Senator who wants to prevent opposition to this great measure and who would get it in such shape that there could be a partisan advantage taken of it, makes an attack, so far as extravagance is concerned, only on the Republicans.

Just the other day the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], while this bill was before the Senate, made a statement here—and it was true—that in the last two Congresses

the Democratic Party had passed river and harbor bills carrying less appropriations than the Republicans had before them. That is true. And I suppose that when this is over, if you carry on the partisanship as the Senator from Colorado has so well begun it, if the fight led by the junior Senator from Iowa results in economy, the campaign speakers and the yellow journals of Democratic persuasion will go before the country and say: "Look at this! Here is a river and harbor bill that is 50 per cent less than a river and harbor bill when the Republicans were in power." They will not say anything about an attempt to hold back Republican opposition by citing things that might and will be used in a partisan way to injure the men who made the fight, the result of which they are going to claim credit for in the coming campaign.

Why, Mr. President, if the Senator had been as unfair to the Democrats as he was to the Republicans, he would have found some astounding results. I have not examined the figures; I do not intend to; but I venture the assertion that I can name three men on the Democratic side whose combined bills asking for authorizations and appropriations will amount to more than the total that was given yesterday by the Senator from Colorado as coming from the entire Republican side. But, Mr. President, it would not be a fair argument, it would not be justice, unless I went into the details and explained what the items were; and I concede then that a large part of it would vanish into thin air. It would be the same kind of an argument, however, that was made yesterday by the Senator from Colorado.

Instead of going out and warning Republicans to cease opposing pork-barrel bills and appropriations, the Senator from Colorado ought to be here united with them, leading the fight, if necessary, to bring about a bill here that would agree even with the ideas of economy of the Senator himself. Instead of taking the position he does and warning Republicans not to prevent this loot, he ought to raise his voice with them, or raise his voice and they would be glad to follow him, in an attack upon this bill, which I believe to be unjust and unfair. He ought to help the men who are protesting instead of trying to scare them away from the fight.

Mr. President, from the very beginning of time civilization has advanced because men had the courage to expose what was wrong. But you just undertake, under the political conditions that exist in this country, to expose what is wrong and you will find that political bosses and machines will search your life back to the time when you left the cradle; and whenever they find anything that is wrong—and when you are hunting for something wrong you can always find it—they will expose it. They will not tell what the real objection to you is, but they will unearth something; and if they tell all the truth, and that will not answer, then they will tell half the truth and put you on the defensive.

We would be in a condition of barbarism to-day if it were not for the men who through history have dared to face criticism, to face condemnation in exposing wrong. The man who has it presented to him as we do here, or if he believes it is presented to him—I want to put it in that way—and does not expose it, is not doing his duty to himself, to his God, or to his country. "To sin by silence when we should protest makes cowards out of men. The world has climbed on protest. If no voice had been raised against ignorance and lust, superstition yet would rule the law, and guillotines decide our least disputes. The few who dare must speak, and speak again, to right the wrongs of many."

I say this, Mr. President, without any criticism upon any man's action. He can take the course even that the Senator from Colorado has taken if he wants to. As I said at the beginning, if many men I know had taken that position I would only have laughed at it and said nothing. But when I saw the Senator from Colorado take it—a man in whose patriotism and whose wisdom and whose judgment and whose fairness I had almost unlimited faith—it seemed to me that I could not, in justice to my own conscience, permit it to pass unnoticed.

Men may favor every item in this bill if they want to, and I will not condemn them. I myself can not see how all of the items can be defended. It may be due to my ignorance, my lack of wisdom and lack of ability; but as far as my wisdom does go, I am going to follow it. And so, I think, those over here and over there who are opposed to this bill are going to do likewise, regardless of the unfair or unjust criticisms that may be made by any man or any set of men.

I am not opposed, Mr. President, to large appropriations. I am not opposed to river and harbor development. On the other hand, I am in favor of that kind of development; and I want to go just as far as honesty and good judgment will bid us go,

regardless of what it costs. But I am just as anxious to prevent the use of Federal funds for the unjust development of localities as I am anxious to have good things accomplished if they can be accomplished with benefit to the people.

I believe the bill is wrong in its method. As long as we pursue this way of legislating for rivers and harbors we will always have, I believe, a pork-barrel proposition. I anticipate—in fact, I know—that the junior Senator from Iowa will have some remedies to suggest and offer. Personally, I believe Congress is not prepared or equipped to say whether there should be \$40,000 or \$10,000 or nothing expended on some creek in Florida or New Jersey or North Carolina or elsewhere. We ought to have, I believe, a nonpartisan permanent board of experts that would carry out a system of development the outlines of which Congress could very appropriately provide for.

There are in this bill items in regard to little creeks and little bayous that have been in the river and harbor bills for 10 or 15 years and are still uncompleted. No man would do that way with his own business or with his own property. If a certain river and its tributaries, for instance, ought to be developed, and can be developed for the improvement of navigation, it ought to be taken as a whole, and ought to be developed as speedily as possible, as speedily as economy and good judgment could provide and advance the work. Instead of that, we appropriate a few thousand dollars this year in a hundred or a hundred and fifty different localities, knowing that next year we are going to do the same, and next year the same, and so on, with the intent of completing the work in perhaps ten or a dozen years. It is not systematic; it is not economy. In the first place, an unbiased judgment would cut out hundreds of them entirely, and then would develop them as a system; and Congress ought to appropriate the money so that that can be carried on to advantage.

There would be no opposition, in my humble judgment, here or elsewhere, to a proper and honest system of development of our rivers and harbors, and there would be no particular criticism as to the amount if it could be justified. But this haphazard way, while it always gets votes in Congress and gets local support in the various localities where the money is expended, brings no return to the taxpayers of the United States.

It seems to me that not only ought we to defeat this bill but we ought to defeat the system. There might often be cases, probably, where it would be a close question as to whether or not a development ought to take place. I would not pretend to offer my judgment, at least, unless I had opportunities to make a close inspection and a complete investigation, and had the necessary qualifications of a technical nature to do that intelligently. So that I am willing to abide by the judgment of intelligent, honest men if a system is provided for, and, as far as I am concerned, give them the money to go ahead with the development.

There are a great many things we ought to do. There is not much use in developing harbors and rivers unless we make by law some provision that will prevent the railroads from putting out of business the men who go into the navigation business on the rivers and the lakes. It seems to me that that could be easily done. We ought to provide also that they should not be allowed to monopolize the harbors of the country. That, I think, could be easily done. Then we ought to provide by law for some tribunal within whose power and whose judgment it would be to investigate, and after investigation, if they thought the project was worthy of development, to develop it, and then have money enough to do it systematically, as a business man would do it in his own business. That kind of river and harbor improvement I would welcome.

We have been just as far from it as we possibly could be. It seems to me that it is unworthy of Congress year after year to sink the public funds of the taxpayers of this country in dry creeks and mudholes where never, under any conceivable conditions, will there be any navigation. This bill is full of such propositions. I expect later on to offer some amendments. I have not had time to give the matter the attention that other Senators have given it, particularly the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], in whose judgment I have great confidence after he has had an opportunity to make and has made an investigation of any proposition. But he is not trying to prevent river and harbor development. He is not trying to prevent the legitimate development of the internal resources of our country. He is not objecting to large appropriations, if he knows they are going to be used for legitimate and honest purposes. But he and those who are his lieutenants, with whom he advises and who follow him mostly in this fight, are not going to be diverted from the course that they believe to be right simply because somebody says, "We are going to expose your extravagant record to the people of the country."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a moment in again referring to some features of my discussion of yesterday. I do not know that I should do so, however, for I am not entirely sure of the standpoint to which any criticism or refutation of mine might be directed.

Some of my Republican associates, and particularly the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], expressed their thanks and gratification that I had drawn attention to the bills calling for appropriations by Republican Senators. Among other things, the Senator from Wyoming expressed a sense of duty only partly performed in that he had introduced so few of them. Other Senators—not, perhaps, so candidly, but indirectly—have expressed some amusement and offered friendly suggestions with regard to some of the bills included in the list to which I had the honor of calling the attention of the Senate yesterday.

I shall not attempt, Mr. President, to reiterate the purpose for which I caused the tabulation to be made, for I have heretofore stated and restated what that purpose was. The Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] this morning expressed regret, and very properly so, that the matter to which these tabulations referred should have been considered as a political subject. If there is any partisanship in the performance, it did not have its origin with me, because if it be partisan or political, then surely the many criticisms and reminders concerning our expenditures which have proceeded from the other side of the Chamber and which prompted me to do that which I have done must have been inspired by a political or a partisan purpose, and if that be true then my rejoinder, if it is at all tinged with partisanship, is due to the attitude of those who provoked the discussion.

I regret very much, Mr. President, that anything which I have done has caused any pain or given rise to any feeling on the part of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. He is evidently much concerned because of the inclusion in my list of certain bills which he introduced, and because of the political use which he thinks can be made of the list by what he calls politicians and yellow journals.

If it be true, Mr. President, that the political fortunes of a Member of this body can be injured or minimized by such a statement as I have submitted to the Senate, then the evil, if it be an evil, and I have not declared it to be one, of introducing bills for these appropriations is more far-reaching and deadly than I supposed.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUSTING in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. THOMAS. In just a moment. I gather that if it be so the abundant material which I have been informed can be provided by this side of the Chamber and in the same direction will be promptly and frequently utilized in the next five or six months and for the purpose to which the Senator referred.

I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I should not want the Senator from Colorado to think that I was induced to say what I did about this matter out of any sense of injury on my part or any sense of pain or any feeling that the Senator from Colorado had been or intended to be unjust to me. I think the kindly and generous disposition of the Senator from Colorado would prevent him from doing anything unjust or malicious. As I have said, it gave me an opportunity to express some views respecting these appropriations that I was glad to take advantage of. That was about all. I was not thinking about myself, politically or otherwise. What might have been said by the Senator from Colorado, that is for the Senator. I have no feeling of resentment myself at anything he has said on the subject as it relates to me.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the few reflections which I have just uttered were based entirely upon the comments and the evident feeling exhibited by the junior Senator from Nebraska. Let me assure the Senator from California that I listened with a great deal of interest and pleasure and with sadness as well to remarks submitted to the Senate by him this morning. I have never even in thought attributed to any action of the Senator from California the notion of extravagance or improper motive, either as to political conviction or as to public expenditure. I know no man in this body who has been a Member of it during the short period of my service for whose convictions, candor, uprightness of purpose, and spotless integrity I have a greater regard.

It was with infinite sadness, Mr. President, that I heard the announcement by the Senator that he did not intend to seek a return to this body. When he leaves the Senate of the United States his retirement will be a distinct loss not only to this body

but to the United States of America. He has been an agency here for good, for uprightness of purpose, for riveting attention upon those sinister and fundamental social and political conditions which, if not corrected, must sooner or later lead to national disaster. He has done his work here and done it well, and the people, when he retires, will follow him in his retirement with their constant and never-failing gratitude.

So, Mr. President, I could not under any circumstances have taken even seeming exception to anything which the Senator from California said this morning nor do I take very serious exception to those criticisms which the Senator from Nebraska has just submitted for our consideration.

I regret extremely that he should feel so sensitive upon this subject and the more so that in the proceedings of yesterday I seem to have lowered myself somewhat in his personal estimation. But I regard what I did as entirely fair, as entirely legitimate, and as entirely appropriate under the circumstances. Nothing which the Senator has so far said convinces me even in the slightest degree to the contrary. Hence while regretting that the Senator has taken the subject so seriously I see nothing that occurred which needs further comment or elaboration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, after line 5, insert:

Sabine-Neches Canal, Tex.: Continuing improvement, \$70,000: *Provided*, That so much of this amount as may be necessary may be expended for making a cut-off at Smiths Bluff, on Neches River.

Mr. KENYON. I think that amendment was given no consideration by the committee and before voting on it I should like to know what the circumstances are in regard to it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator from Texas is not in his seat at this moment, but I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that we agreed to take up the East River item at this time. I ask that the amendment just read be passed over and that we proceed to the consideration of the amendment to strike out, which appears on the top of page 6 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the item will be passed over. The amendment at the top of page 6 will be stated.

The SECRETARY. At the top of page 6 strike out from line 1 to line 15 in the following words:

East River, N. Y.: For improvement with a view to providing a channel 35 feet deep from deep water in New York Harbor to the Brooklyn Navy Yard in accordance with so much of the report published in House Document No. 188, Sixty-third Congress, first session, as applies to the channel west of the navy yard, \$200,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War may enter into a contract or contracts for such materials and work as may be necessary to prosecute the said project, to be paid for as appropriations may from time to time be made by law, not to exceed in the aggregate \$500,000, exclusive of the amount herein and heretofore appropriated: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as adopting the said project beyond the work to the extent and in the manner specified.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, not for the purpose of discussing this amendment, but just at this point I should like to take a few minutes to present to the Senate the matters which have already been passed which affect particularly those items relative to Florida mentioned in the bill. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] challenged some explanation regarding certain of those items, and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] indicated this morning that no explanations were forthcoming and there had been no presentation of the reasons justifying some of the improvements which have been objected to. For that reason I should like to have the indulgence of the Senate for a very few minutes in order to place in the Record the facts regarding the few projects located in Florida that were mentioned by the Senator from Iowa as not being satisfactory to him.

One of those projects was the Choctawhatchee River. The facts regarding that river are that it is in length about 200 miles. The section now under improvement extends from Newton, Ala., downstream 140 miles to the mouth. It is quite a considerable river. The pending bill provides for the maintenance of a navigable channel at low water from the mouth to Newton, Ala., including Cypress Top Outlet.

The river and harbor act of July 5, 1884, provided for the project. There was another act, the act of June 13, 1902, which added the improvement of Cypress Top Outlet, one of the mouths of the stream, but no provision was made for maintenance in either of these acts.

The present appropriation provided in this bill is to cover the operations for the next year, and the work will consist of maintenance by dredging and snagging and some construction work and making surveys where necessary.

"The funds now available," the report of the committee shows, and that is based on the report of the Chief of Engineers

of 1915, "will be expended by March 31, 1916." It is proposed to expend the funds requested for maintenance work as follows: Operating snag boats for one year, \$30,000.

The original project has been completed. The river is in good condition, the reports show, from the mouth 27½ miles to the mouth of Holmes River, and from that point to Geneva, 96 miles above the mouth, the worst obstructions have been removed, but the river is yet in a bad condition.

The effect of the improvement on freight rates was beneficial as long as the improvement was maintained in good condition. At present, in connection with the Holmes River, it affords transportation to a large section of Florida that is without other means. Its restoration to a good condition will probably result in lowering the freight rates by rail to Geneva.

There has been, as the Senator from Iowa, I think, mentioned, some decrease of commerce in the last year, but the report shows that the reason for that was the temporary cessation of naval stores and the lumber industry. It may be stated that the effect of the European war was decidedly injurious to the naval stores and lumber industries, especially naval stores. Nearly two-thirds, perhaps four-fifths, of the naval stores were disposed of in foreign countries. Germany was a large buyer, and other countries involved in the war afforded a demand for naval stores. That industry, of course, suffered in consequence of the discontinuance of transportation and the loss of shipping facilities as well as the market. It is gradually coming back. The demand has increased and the price of naval stores has gone to a point where operators are able to continue the industry. All that commerce will come back to the river.

At present the commerce consists principally of naval stores, general merchandise, cotton, fertilizers, provisions, and hardware, and it amounted in 1912 in value to \$1,732,000.

I submit, Mr. President, that heretofore no provision having been made for maintenance in the prosecution of the improvement the estimate of \$30,000 for maintenance and for work on this river, as indicated in the report, for a distance of 140 miles is not an excessive amount to expend. It is a stream that, as the report shows, affords the transportation means of getting to markets for a large section of the State which has no railroad lines or any other means of transportation.

It will be noted that there is no large sum to be expended here in further improvement on the river. This is an estimate for maintenance work. This would put it in a condition where it can be of additional use and benefit, especially that portion of the river which has been neglected, because the other bills have carried no appropriation for maintenance in the past.

The Withlacoochee River is mentioned on page 170 of the committee report. The project there is about 85 per cent completed. The item in the bill is for maintenance, not for any additional work nor any new work nor any further improvement. It is for the operation of the dredge *Sarasota*, "for maintenance, \$5,000." There is a river on which private individuals, the Dunnellon Phosphate Co., spent \$200,000 of its own money. The incomplete improvement of the upper river from Port Inglis north does not affect commerce to any great advantage, because it is incomplete, but on the river from Dunnellon to the Gulf phosphate has moved in enormous quantities in the past, and that has been one of the chief articles of commerce. That portion of the river is the portion upon which private enterprise spent \$200,000, and the report states to what extent the improvement from Port Inglis to the Gulf, partly by Federal and partly by private funds, reduced freight rates. Port Inglis is between Dunnellon and the Gulf, just within the river entrance. The report says:

The improvement from Port Inglis to the Gulf, partly by Federal and partly by private funds, reduced freight rates on phosphate from this territory fully 50 per cent and has opened an outlet for a large tonnage in this commodity.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the name of the private company that spent \$200,000?

Mr. FLETCHER. The Dunnellon Phosphate Co.

Mr. NORRIS. What is their business?

Mr. FLETCHER. The mining and shipping of phosphate.

Mr. NORRIS. They are shipping phosphate out?

Mr. FLETCHER. Out of this river. Of course there are other articles of commerce moving on the river.

Mr. NORRIS. What other commerce is there on that river?

Mr. FLETCHER. The water-borne commerce on the river amounted in 1914 to 95,778 tons, valued at \$832,045, of which amount 3,700 tons, chiefly citrus fruits and cypress blocks, were carried on the river, and the remainder, consisting of fish and oysters, groceries, iron pyrites, lumber, and phosphate rock, was handled between Port Inglis and the mouth.

Mr. NORRIS. Where is that phosphate rock shipped to?

Mr. FLETCHER. The phosphate rock has been shipped to foreign markets; largely to Germany.

Mr. NORRIS. Must it be reloaded after it is shipped?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; the depth of water is sufficient at Port Inglis to accommodate the vessels which load there and take the phosphate abroad.

Mr. NORRIS. Do the people who have paid this money own the territory where the phosphate rock is located?

Mr. FLETCHER. They own the mines and the land upon which the rock is mined, I take it.

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose their expenditure was made because in their judgment it was a good business proposition and would be of financial assistance to them?

Mr. FLETCHER. Undoubtedly it did help them, but the report says—and this is the fact about it:

This work, while primarily for the benefit of the company, to enable it to ship the product of its mines, was also of general benefit to navigation, and the channel dug now forms part of the adopted project.

Mr. NORRIS. What are the facts in relation to towns located along the navigable portion of the river? For instance, is there any passenger traffic?

Mr. FLETCHER. I take it that that is rather limited. There is not a great deal of passenger traffic.

Mr. NORRIS. Is it in the northern part of the State?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; it is in the peninsular portion of the State, on the western side. Port Inglis is at the mouth of the river, which flows into the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. NORRIS. Is the country pretty well settled up and developed along there?

Mr. FLETCHER. The river extends quite a considerable distance farther into the interior. It reaches from large lakes, which are near the center of the peninsular portion of the State. That portion of it has not been improved which extends above Dunnellon. Its total length is about 120 miles.

Mr. NORRIS. Are there railroads on the stream or in any reasonable proximity to it?

Mr. FLETCHER. There are railroads crossing the river, but none leading down to the Gulf along or near the river.

Mr. NORRIS. Where is the outlet of the river? It flows into the Gulf?

Mr. FLETCHER. It flows into the Gulf of Mexico, running from the center of the peninsular portion of the State southwestward to the Gulf.

Mr. NORRIS. How many miles long is the navigable part?

Mr. FLETCHER. Twenty-four and one-half miles. Dunnellon is 24½ miles from the mouth of the river. This principal improvement is in that stretch of the river. The section on which the work has been done mainly is a little over 4 miles in length at the entrance to the river.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the depth of the water? What kind of boats can go up there?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is a channel of 10 feet at low water in depth and 100 feet wide.

Mr. NORRIS. Do boats drawing only 10 feet cross the ocean.

Mr. FLETCHER. Oh, no; the rock is transferred to ships crossing the ocean.

The Senator made the point, I believe, that there has been a falling off of commerce. That is true for the reason that there has been no movement of phosphate on account of the European war. Phosphate was largely shipped to Germany, and we brought back potash. That was largely the market for this hard rock phosphate.

Mr. NORRIS. As a matter of fact, it was shipped over in that form to a great extent and shipped back in the manufactured form, was it not?

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not so sure. It came back probably to some extent in manufactured form. We usually brought back German potash. Phosphate, potash, and nitrogen are the three necessary elements for plant food. Florida furnishes about 70 per cent of all the phosphate mined in this country, and the domestic market is oversupplied. Foreign countries heretofore took the larger portion of our output.

Mr. NORRIS. In regard to the decline of traffic, I have not looked at this river particularly; but from the examination I have made on a large number of them there has been a decline for a good many years in traffic. How was the traffic on that river prior to the war? Was it increasing or decreasing?

Mr. FLETCHER. It was increasing. The report shows the value of commerce in 1912 was \$1,394,742; in 1913, \$1,516,482. Then came the war, and the phosphate shipments were practically discontinued. The commerce fell off to such an extent that in 1914 it was \$832,045.

This item is only \$5,000, and it is for maintenance, to maintain that waterway, and it is a very important waterway. The

business of that industry alone would be almost destroyed if they were not able to use this waterway.

Mr. NORRIS. In what does the maintenance consist mostly? What is the work?

Mr. FLETCHER. The operation of the dredge *Sarasota*.

Mr. NORRIS. They have to dredge it somewhat in some places?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is all that is done—to dredge it.

The Senator from Iowa, I believe, mentioned the Anclote River, Fla. I will say in reference to that item that the only provision in the bill is for "maintenance, to operate the dredge *Sarasota* two months, \$3,000." The effect of the improvement, as stated in the report, has resulted in making Tarpon Springs the headquarters for the sponging fleet on the west coast, and the most important sponge market in the United States. Freight rates have been reduced approximately 20 per cent by reason of that improvement. The commercial statistics show that the water-borne commerce for the calendar year 1914 amounted to 14,095 tons, valued at \$1,551,250, consisting of fertilizers, fish, oysters, logs, lumber, ship chandlery, and general merchandise.

At times there may be some falling off of shipments on these rivers in the way of logs or lumber or phosphate or naval stores, or products of that kind, which move to foreign markets largely. When the foreign market is cut off, necessarily the commerce decreases for the time, but the products are there, and the commerce is bound to increase in the future rather than decrease as soon as normal conditions are reached.

The only item in this case, as I said, is a small provision for the maintenance of that channel.

I will not take further time in discussing that item. It seems to me the objection can not reasonably be urged to the maintenance of these improvements, which have been adopted by Congress, and where the work has been in many instances completed or largely completed. It is simply a question of preserving what has been accomplished by former appropriations.

Some reference was made to the Oklawaha River.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Senator leaves Anclote River I wish to call his attention to the fact that July 1, 1915, there was an unexpended balance of \$5,000. Can the Senator tell us why that appropriation has not been expended? In the appropriation act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, there was appropriated for this river for maintenance \$5,073.50, and we find on July 1, 1915, an unexpended balance of \$5,000. The department recommends \$3,000 for the river for 1917 for maintenance.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes. The funds "now available"—that is, when the report was made in 1915—the department holds will be sufficient for necessary maintenance work during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916. The additional funds asked for are to maintain the improvements during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the \$3,000?

Mr. FLETCHER. That is the \$3,000.

Mr. SMOOT. But what did they do for the fiscal year 1916?

Mr. FLETCHER. This report was made up to June 30, 1915. From then until now that \$5,000 has been consumed in maintenance work, and there is further need of this \$3,000 to carry the maintenance until 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. I see that the traffic on the river, if it may be called traffic, has decreased from 1912. In that year there were transported 35,100 tons, and in 1914 it had fallen off until there were 14,095 tons. I ask the Senator if that is going to continue to decrease, and is it on account of any lack of appropriation that it is so decreasing?

Mr. FLETCHER. It has decreased because of the inability to move lumber in the quantities in which we were able to move it previously; shipping conditions having been such that it has been impossible to get the lumber shipped.

Mr. SMOOT. Is phosphate rock a part of the shipments made upon the river?

Mr. FLETCHER. Not upon this river. There were no phosphates carried on this river. The commerce consists of fertilizer, fish and oysters, logs and lumber, ship chandlery, and general merchandise. There is no phosphate moved on this river.

Mr. SMOOT. I see the report claims that the decrease over the tonnage of 1913 is due to the falling off of the shipments of logs and lumber.

Mr. FLETCHER. Of logs and lumber. That is because the lumber shippers can not put the lumber into the market without paying such enormous freight rates that they are practically prohibitory at present. That condition, however, we expect will not obtain for many more months or years. The lumber is there; there will be a demand for it; it can be moved and will be moved on this river. It is partially because of the

falling off of the shipments; but the value of the commerce for 1914, the Senator will observe, was greater than in 1912, although the tonnage seems to have been less. The value was \$1,051,250 for 1914. As I say, the item is simply to provide for the maintenance for the coming year, until June, 1917.

Mr. SMOOT. Is there not fall enough in the river, so that they could float those logs instead of transporting them on barges?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no difficulty about floating the logs, I take it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the most of the tonnage, I should judge from this report.

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; but the amount of logs and lumber depends on getting them beyond the point where the river reaches; and from that point the rates are so high that that movement for the present has been discontinued very largely. I do not think it has been entirely discontinued.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. KENYON. Of the tonnage cited by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] logs seem to constitute 10,500 tons and pine lumber 1,125 tons out of the 14,095 short tons. I note in the Engineer's report that they say:

Number of regular steamers in the trade, one launch.

I will ask the Senator if it is correct that there are no steamers there but one launch?

Mr. FLETCHER. Of course, I am not prepared to say with reference to that. I should be controlled by the Engineer's report as to the number of steamers; but the commerce on the river is not passenger business at all. There is no need of steamers. Barges and other boats can take care of the commerce without steamers.

Mr. KENYON. I suppose the lumber floats in rafts, does it not?

Mr. FLETCHER. The logs float in rafts and the lumber is transported in barges usually, though it may move some distance in rafts under some conditions.

Mr. KENYON. There seem to be no barges at all, according to the engineers' report, but there are some rafts.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is probable that, for comparatively short distances, they can float lumber also in rafts. I am not sure whether or not it moves in that way, but ordinarily I should say it is moved on barges. The logs, of course, are rafted.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, on page 2474 of the Army Engineer's report, volume 2, it is stated that the average distance carried of the different kinds of freight traffic set forth is eighty-five one-hundredths of a mile, as to fertilizer and as to general merchandise. Then, as to the other articles, there is the figure "1," which refers to the bottom of the page, and is marked "local." What does that mean; that the transportation is merely local?

Mr. FLETCHER. That it is to and from points on the river. The total length of the river is 20 miles.

Mr. KENYON. Not this project. It is about 3½ miles.

Mr. FLETCHER. This improvement covers a distance of 3½ miles, but the river is about 20 miles in length.

This river rises in the western part of Florida and flows northwesterly, emptying into the Gulf of Mexico about 38 miles north of the entrance to Tampa Bay. Its total length is about 20 miles. The section under improvement extends from the mouth to the county bridge at Tarpon Springs, a distance of 3.6 miles.

It is quite a considerable river, and there is a good deal of local business on it.

Now, as to the Oklawaha River:

The section under improvement extends from the mouth to Leesburg, at the head of Lake Griffin, a distance of 94 miles.

The project is believed to be about 70 per cent completed.

Available funds will probably be exhausted before March 1, 1916. To keep the river open annual maintenance work is necessary, and for this purpose the following estimate is submitted.

Then follows an estimate for dredging, and so forth, a total of \$10,000.

The tonnage shows an increase over last year, due to the resumption of logging.

The water-borne commerce on the river for the calendar year 1914 amounted to 34,430 tons, valued at \$248,991, consisting of citrus fruits, hay and grain, logs, naval stores, vegetables, and general merchandise.

There has been considerable local cooperation, as shown by the fact that—

The city of Leesburg has dug a canal 2,500 feet long, 100 feet wide, and 5 feet deep from Lake Griffin to a point within easy reach of the business portion of the city, and a similar canal 2,200 feet long, 100

feet wide, and 6 feet deep from Lake Harris, with the object of enabling boats to land near the mercantile and shipping section.

This waterway connects St. Johns River with these important lakes and the interior of the peninsula portion of Florida. It is a river that ought to be improved very much more extensively than is contemplated in this report. I will not go into that now, but the proposal here is to keep the river open, and for its maintenance, at a cost of \$10,000 for the year. It is a river 94 miles long and a very important waterway. I can not see, Mr. President, that there can be any reasonable objection to an expenditure of a small sum like that on a waterway of that kind.

I should like to have inserted in the RECORD that portion of the report which deals with the Oklawaha River.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

OKLAWAHA RIVER, FLA.

[Eng. Rept., 1915, p. 643; H. Doc. 514, 63d Cong.]

Location: This river has its source in the central part of Florida and flows in a general northerly direction, then eastwardly, emptying into the St. Johns River 22 miles above Palatka. Its length from the mouth to Lake Griffin is 86 miles. The extreme head of the system may be taken as Lake Apopka, 120 miles above the mouth of the river. The section under improvement extends from the mouth to Leesburg, at the head of Lake Griffin, a distance of 94 miles.

Present project: The improvement under the present project was inaugurated by Congress in the river and harbor act of September 19, 1890. It provided for clearing the channel from Lake Griffin to the mouth by removing snags, overhanging trees, and floating obstructions, with a view to obtaining a navigable depth of about 4 feet at low stages. The cost of the proposed work was estimated in 1892 at \$26,000, with \$1,000 annually for maintenance. The project was modified by Congress in the river and harbor act of March 2, 1907, to provide for removing obstructions and deepening the channel to 6 feet at mean low water from the mouth to and including Silver Springs Run, a distance of 62 miles, at an estimated additional cost of \$15,000, and \$600 annually for maintenance. By the river and harbor acts of June 25, 1910, and July 25, 1912, the project was further modified to provide for the maintenance of the levels in the lakes at the head of the river.

Condition at the end of fiscal year: The project is believed to be about 70 per cent completed. There is now a fairly well cleared channel approximately 6 feet deep for the first 32 miles above the mouth and a practicable channel from 5 to 5½ feet deep to the head of Silver Springs Run. The channel between Silver Springs Run and Leesburg has shoaled and become obstructed with water plants, and not more than 2 to 2½ feet can be carried over this part of the river. The total expenditure under the present project to June 30, 1915, has been \$74,157.24, of which \$33,531.32 was for original work and \$40,625.92 was for maintenance.

Local cooperation: None is required by the appropriation acts. The city of Leesburg has dug a canal 2,500 feet long, 100 feet wide, and 5 feet deep from Lake Griffin to a point within easy reach of the business portion of the city, and a similar canal 2,200 feet long, 100 feet wide, and 6 feet deep from Lake Harris, with the object of enabling boats to land near the mercantile and shipping section. Lake Dora has been connected with Lake Eustis by a canal 1½ miles long, 25 feet wide, and 3 feet deep, dug by private enterprise at a cost of about \$15,000. This canal enables small boats to pass from Lake Eustis to Lake Dora. In 1911 the owners of a basin of muck land along the river between Heather Island (60 miles above the mouth) and Moss Bluff (72 miles above the mouth) dug a channel 4.6 miles long and about 6 feet deep and 26 feet wide near the higher land on the east side of the basin and diverted the river into the new channel, cutting off about 6½ miles of the old river. The work was done with the object of facilitating the drainage of the basin, but incidentally it has proved, on the whole, of benefit to navigation.

Effect of improvement: No effect on freight rates has been observed. **Proposed operations:** Available funds will probably be exhausted before March 1, 1916. To keep the river open annual maintenance work is necessary, and for this purpose the following estimate is submitted:

Dredging in continuation of improvement and for maintenance, with hired plant, 3 months, at \$2,250.....	\$6,750
Operation of snagging party, 4 months, at \$750.....	3,000
Contingencies	250
	10,000

Commercial statistics: The water-borne commerce on the river for the calendar year 1914 amounted to 34,430 tons, valued at \$248,991, consisting of citrus fruits, hay and grain, logs, naval stores, vegetables, and general merchandise. The tonnage shows an increase over last year, due to the resumption of logging, which under present conditions forms the bulk of the tonnage.

Comparative statement.

Year.	Tons.	Value.
1912.....	102,206	\$1,055,464
1913.....	14,622	546,045
1914.....	34,420	248,991

Financial summary.

Amount expended on all projects to June 30, 1915:	
New work.....	\$37,443.27
Maintenance.....	40,625.92
Total.....	78,069.19
July 1, 1915, balance unexpended.....	4,552.76
Amount recommended by department for maintenance for 1917.....	10,000.00

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I believe that covers the items which have been mentioned with reference to Florida; and I do not care to take up the time of the Senate in any general discussion of this bill. The bill has one fault, and only one, in my judgment, and that is that it is confined to projects which are already under way and does not take care of projects that have passed examination by the engineers and have the indorsement and approval of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of War, as reported to Congress.

We can not continue very much longer, Mr. President, with merely taking care of old projects which Congress has approved years ago, which are partially completed and already under construction. We must provide for those projects which have been approved by the district engineer, approved by the Board of Engineers, approved by the Chief of Engineers, and reported to Congress favorably by the Secretary of War as being worthy of improvement after all the study and investigation which these responsible officials have given the subject.

We have no business to talk about spending money for preparedness or any other purpose if we must neglect internal improvements, the duty of taking care of which rests upon Congress. These are navigable streams. No individual can exercise any control of them or can undertake even to improve one of them without first getting the permission of the Board of Engineers. No individual can go into a harbor on the coast anywhere and spend his money to deepen that harbor without asking permission of the Government, through the War Department, to do so. He can not expend his own money to deepen and widen a river without asking permission to do it. Congress has jurisdiction over these navigable waterways, and it is incumbent upon Congress to take care of the waterways just as well as to take care of the harbors of the country; and we are neglecting our duty, we are shirking our responsibility, we are short-sighted, and guilty of inexcusable neglect of the public interest, in my judgment, when we fail to go on with the care, maintenance, and improvements of the highways of commerce—the rivers and the harbors of this country—which have been recommended for improvement because of their commercial justification and because of the merit in them by the boards charged with the duty of examining and studying and reporting upon them.

It has been mentioned here that there is a sentiment against the present system inaugurated for the improvement of the waterways, the rivers and harbors of this country. If so it is created by the cry of "pork barrel," and that sort of thing, for purposes which I do not care to characterize, but not in all instances in good faith, in my judgment. That sentiment has been manufactured; it has been created; it is not the judgment of the people of this country that we ought to neglect these waterways or fail to take care of them or to make the improvements for which the Federal Government is responsible. There is no better system, it seems to me, which can be devised than the present system.

A survey, when ordered by Congress, is referred to the district engineer. He is a responsible official; he is under nobody's control or influence; he is not elected in any district or by the people of any State; he is in office during good behavior; he is trained; he knows his business; he feels his responsibility; he is faithful to his trust; and he makes the examination and reports that the project is worthy of improvement or that it is not worthy of improvement; that its cost will be so much, and that Congress would not be justified in appropriating that amount of money for that improvement, or, otherwise, that Congress would be justified. That report comes to another responsible body, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The members of that board are not dependent on any county, State, or community for their positions. They are entirely independent, faithful, competent, honorable men of the highest integrity and of the very best capacity. Those men consider these reports, and, if that is desired, hearings are had before this board, and the Board of Engineers passes on the subject. Then the Board of Engineers reports to the Chief of Engineers, and the Chief of Engineers reports to the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of War to Congress. I can conceive of no safer or better way of safeguarding the public expenditures and of conducting these great public enterprises than the present plan provides, and I think all this talk about "pork barrel" and about favoritism and about influence, local or otherwise, is uncalled for, unwarranted, and that any sort of criticism that suggests nothing better is simply destructive criticism and gets nowhere. No plan has been proposed to change that system which in any way commends itself to Congress.

The proposal of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] to make a lump-sum appropriation as a substitute for this bill is, in my

judgment, unsound. So far as I am concerned, I would rather see the bill go down in defeat than to see that amendment adopted. If Senators want to take the responsibility of stopping the improvement of the public waterways of the country, those which are under the jurisdiction of Congress because of their navigability, if Senators want to take the responsibility of saying "we will not spend another dollar on the rivers and harbors of the country," let them take it; and they would take that responsibility in effect if they should appropriate a lump sum in this bill, as they have done in the last two bills, because it would mean an absolute abandonment of the present system and plan of carrying on these improvements. It would mean that Congress was unwilling to be guided by the judgment and the opinion of the experts who are qualified to pass on these questions; that Congress discredits the reports made to it by the Chief of Engineers, by the Board of Engineers, and by the district engineers as to the merits of the various projects which have been undertaken in the past and which have already been reported for action to Congress. It would mean to say that we have no faith in the worthiness or the merit of any project now under way or heretofore reported on. I do not propose to put myself in that attitude under any consideration, because it would not only be contrary to my judgment and convictions, but it would be absolutely absurd, without any justification whatever, and unwise from the standpoint of the public interest.

So, Mr. President, I say that this bill ought to be passed as reported by the committee, and that, if it can not be passed in that form, I would rather have it defeated than to have the substitute proposed by the Senator from Iowa adopted. We have done that thing for the last two years. The last two river and harbor bills have provided lump-sum appropriations. If we did that thing again, it would mean clearly that that was the policy intended to be pursued by Congress; it would mean the tearing down and destruction of what Congress has heretofore done, a complete reversal of its position on this important question; and the consequence would be that when the time came again for taking care of the rivers and harbors there would be no appropriation at all provided. It would mean a complete abandonment of these great public works.

Mr. O'GORMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to his colleague?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Hardwick	Myers	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Hitchcock	Nelson	Smoot
Brandegge	Hollis	Newlands	Sterling
Broussard	Hughes	Norris	Stone
Chamberlain	Husting	O'Gorman	Thomas
Clapp	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Page	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Kenyon	Pittman	Wadsworth
Curtis	La Follette	Poincxter	Warren
Dillingham	Lane	Ransdell	Williams
Fall	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Works
Fletcher	Lewis	Sheppard	
Gallinger	Lippitt	Sherman	
Gore	Lodge	Simmons	

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire again to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. TOWNSEND] on account of sickness in his family. I desire also to state that he is paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN]. I wish this announcement to stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, on page 6 of the bill before the Senate is an amendment proposed by the Senate Commerce Committee, striking out what I regard as perhaps the most important provision in the entire bill. The expense involved can not be the excuse for this action by the committee, because it provides for an appropriation of only \$200,000, while making an authorization for \$500,000. It contemplates an improvement regarded by the President and the Navy Department as absolutely imperative. It relates to one of the most important rivers of the country. It is not one of the streams that have figured frequently, and doubtless figure now in this bill, which in the dry season practically dry up and are incapable of navigation, and never will be fit for navigation, notwithstanding the vast sums of money taken out of the Public Treasury to waste upon those improvements.

In 1914 the commerce on the East River amounted to 46,000,000 short tons, valued at \$1,500,000,000. It carried more than 22,000,000 passengers. Yet this committee, for some reason—perhaps not stated before the Senate—has seen fit to strike out this proposed appropriation, which was incorporated in the House bill after careful consideration of its merits and in response to a personal appeal by the President of the United States and the Secretary of the Navy. The immediate appropriation is \$200,000 with an authorization for \$500,000 more.

In the East River, which runs for a length of 16 miles north of New York Harbor, there are only two points where the depth is less than 35 feet. Diamond Reef is one of those points; in close proximity to the most important navy yard in the United States—the Brooklyn Navy Yard. They are now launching dreadnoughts from time to time with a draft of 30 to 31 feet, while the depth of water over this reef is but 26 feet. In order to avoid this menace to safe navigation, our great battleships can enter the navy yard only once a day, and at high tide. Not only can it be said in favor of the proposition that it is a commercial necessity, but from the standpoint of preparedness it is indispensable; and yet, if the Senate is to act with the committee, notwithstanding all these urgent reasons, this absolutely essential improvement is going to be eliminated.

A great deal can be said, I think, in criticism of the judgment of the Senate with respect to this provision. I am reluctant at this time to say more than that this is a just provision, it is a necessary provision, and in some respects it is vital in any broad scheme of national preparedness. I should prefer to withhold further comment until the Senate may be advised as to the reasons that animated the committee in taking this action. I should be very glad to hear from the distinguished chairman of the committee what reasons led him and his distinguished associates to take this most extraordinary action.

I pause for the information, if the Senator is disposed to give it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, it is my purpose to make a few remarks about the action of the committee on this particular item at some appropriate time before it is submitted to a vote, but I would not care to intrude upon the Senator while he is speaking.

Mr. O'GORMAN. It will not be an intrusion. I shall yield the floor now to the chairman of the committee, reserving the privilege of asking the attention of the Senate at another time.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], I understand, desires to address the Senate, and I thought it was due him to afford him that opportunity now, if he cares to exercise it. If not, I have no objection to presenting the reasons that actuated the committee.

I think there is some force in what the senior Senator from New York has said. The improvement of New York Harbor is a matter always of vital concern in the development of the water transportation facilities of this country. The fact is New York is a favorite of national action, and ought to be. It is the very heart of the commerce and life of the Republic; and there is nothing that is proper and fairly within the means of the National Government that ought not to be done at that point, because it not only contributes to national pride but it promotes the national interest. The committee was not actuated by any spirit of hostility to New York nor to this particular enterprise.

In the first place, the committee found that the engineers were not agreed as to the proper channel to improve at that point. It seems that two investigations were made for the purpose of determining the most eligible point at which a deeper channel could be provided to the Brooklyn Navy Yard. One of the examinations and surveys was made under the direction of Col. Black, now the Chief of Engineers; another by Col. Roessler, a very eminent officer in the Engineer Corps. They reached different conclusions. Col. Roessler reported in favor of what is known as the Buttermilk Channel, and his report passed through the several stages necessary to make it an approved project, and the Board of Engineers decided that that particular channel should be improved in preference to this one. Subsequently Col. Black's report was submitted, providing for the channel mentioned in this particular bill.

The report submitted by Col. Black was for a more comprehensive project, known as Document No. 188, Sixty-third Congress, first session, and providing for the channel through the East River just as is described in the bill which the Commerce Committee has recommended for rejection. That particular part of the work is only a single unit in the larger program, and the program itself will be a failure if the several units that constitute it are not brought into harmony; the main fea-

ture being that a depth of 35 feet should be furnished for all the shipping facilities that are grouped at that point. The project of which the pending amendment is a part, and which received the second approval of the Board of Engineers, calls for an expenditure of \$29,659,561. The project itself consists of five or six different units, the one under consideration now being only one of these.

I should say that it would not tend to a proper development of the shipping facilities at that point to improve one of the reaches of the harbor upon a basis of 35 feet without providing a similar depth for all of those that are associated in the shipping activities that concentrate there.

Leaving out any question, therefore, of a choice between these particular routes, it became a matter of importance to the committee to take time to determine whether or not the present necessity of providing for this particular item was of sufficient importance to practically commit the Government to the expenditure of the remaining \$29,000,000. The Buttermilk Channel contemplates no such expensive outlay, and if the purpose be simply to provide for a 35-foot depth to the navy yard it can be much more readily and cheaply accomplished by improving that particular channel.

That is, in a way, the right of subsequent investigation that the committee saw proper to reserve to itself so far as the merits of the project itself are concerned. Then there entered into its consideration a matter of policy. It was given out authoritatively that this bill was to contain no new projects. That matter was submitted to the House of Representatives, and by a yea-and-nay vote that policy was declared to be the one that should govern in the preparation of this bill. An exception was made in favor of this particular item because of the insistence of the President, in a letter addressed to some one officially connected with the matter, wherein he based his recommendation upon the necessities that grow out of the military situation. He associated it with the so-called preparedness program. It was not insisted upon as a matter that would immediately promote the commercial interests of that particular port.

The committee felt that as long as they were confronted by that policy of a coordinate branch of the legislative part of our Government, it was well for us to determine whether or not the Senate would also take that view of it. We added 15 or 20 amendments. Some of them we deemed to be quite as meritorious as this particular item. We felt that we ought to enter the conference which will take place in the event the two Houses disagree on that policy upon a footing of absolute equality, and have an opportunity to compare the merits of this particular project with those that were inserted in the Senate bill. If we were confronted by a cast-iron instruction that would withdraw from the House conferees the right to consider any proposition simply because it was new, overlooking its merits entirely, then it would be a matter for further consideration to determine whether or not, if the policy was to be carried out at all, it was to be carried out in its entirety. We thought, too, that we might present the merits of the so-called Buttermilk Channel—a project that will cost very much less, and will accomplish much more readily and immediately the purposes that are in view.

It has been said that we struck out the item for trading purposes. Well, every one selects his own terms in which to express his own ideas. In a way, that element might be said to enter into it; but we can justify our action by a little more conservative and justifiable statement than that. We felt that we were entitled to put it upon the Democratic footing of "special privileges to none and equal rights to all"; that if the projects added by the Senate were to be subjected to scrutiny it was nothing more than right that this particular project, which stood upon identically the same claim of merit, should be considered surrounded by the same circumstances and conditions. In that sense it was a trade, but the trade did not partake of any corrupt or secret agreement. It was a public declaration of a policy to consider in cooperation with those who had a right to be consulted as to whether or not that policy should be applied at this time in its strictness and do justice to the country.

It was said that the present condition of the public revenues would not permit the Senate to exercise an absolute legislative discretion in making up this bill. In addition to the items contained in the bill, those included in the House bill as well as those added by the Senate, there are about \$150,000,000 of projects that have been approved in the regular way by the Board of Engineers and forwarded to Congress for such action as it sees proper to take. So, out of that \$150,000,000 of approved projects, located all over the country, the committee saw proper to select those that will cost in the aggregate about \$3,000,000.

For instance, a project in Connecticut appealed to us very strongly as one of necessity and of justice as well. An additional project was added for the State of New York, to join the great canal system with the rivers in connection with which the canals are intended to be operated. We thought that the harbors in California at San Diego and at Los Angeles were worthy of improvement; and we thought well of other projects that had been certified to us by the executive officers of the Government. Nearly any one of these four can be considered in connection with this particular item without suffering any on its merits; and we felt that if we were to enter a conference where those matters were to come into competition, or where principles were observed that would include one and exclude the other, we ought to enter that negotiation upon a footing of absolute equality and independence.

The action of the committee, therefore, had its justification in the fact that this was not the only project to accomplish the same purpose that was submitted to us. There was fair room for doubt as between the two; and if expense was to be considered, and this particular project alone was to be considered, the Buttermilk Channel was the better one. If, however, it was the purpose of the Congress to select the larger project, involving an expenditure of \$29,000,000, and it was deemed wise to pick out one unit in that larger plan and begin work upon it at this time, then, of course, the preference would go in favor of the East River route.

That is just exactly, briefly, the reason that lay at the foundation of the committee's action. It is submitted to the Senate for what it is worth, and whatever the Senate does about it is just exactly what we want done about it. The committee had no particular preference about its action except as it represented the Senate; and it intended that its action should be submitted to the Senate frankly and openly, so that whatever action was taken would represent the policy of the Senate in this connection.

Of course, if the Senate expresses a preference for that particular item and takes away from the Senate conferees the right to insist upon a comparative consideration of the question, it carries with it a certain implication that the Senate conferees do not have behind them the sentiment of the Senate that they ought to insist upon their items as vigorously as they might if they were in a position where they could insist that the other House should accord to the Senate the right to make meritorious exceptions to the rule, just as the House had exercised its right to do.

That is all there is in it. The matter is submitted to the Senate for whatever action it may see proper to take.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me for a minute?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. NELSON. Is it not a fact that for the sake of preserving two important items from the State of New York that we inserted in the bill—to wit, the Lake Champlain item and the Buffalo item—we thought it was good policy to leave the other out, so that we could perhaps secure all three?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We could at least consider all three upon a footing of equality.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senate does not sustain us on this East River item we may have to give way on the other two items in conference. We might as well talk very plainly on this subject.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Oh, I have no disposition to conceal anything.

Mr. NELSON. The bill came over from the House with the understanding that we were not to put in any new provision at all, except the one solitary item they put in. We broke over that rule and put in a few new items.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We had to do it, to do justice, as we understood our duty.

Mr. NELSON. Yes. Especially three of those items I regarded as very important. We will have to fight for those items in conference, and I hope the Senate will leave us in position to make a good fight to retain them.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I am very glad the Senator agrees with me.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, the very illuminating remarks of the Senator from Arkansas, together with those offered by the Senator from Minnesota, almost persuade me to take the position advocated by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. If a proposition on its merits is of such doubtful propriety that the members of the committee candidly avow that legislation can not be accomplished without throwing out some inducement here and there, giving every locality its price

for the support of the measure, then it is clear that the proposal is not in the public interest, and should be defeated.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I do.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Does the Senator know an item in this bill of that character which the committee has recommended for adoption?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I know what has been stated here several times by the Senator from Iowa and by the Senator from Colorado. If it be avowed, as has been stated in the last few minutes, that an appropriation is dropped out to permit the committee in conference to have a basis of negotiation and trading and conceding this or that, it leads me to the conclusion that the entire proposition can not be defended upon its merits and lends much support to the criticism of this class of legislation.

Mr. President, a moment ago when I was referring to the importance of the commerce of the East River I am not sure whether I correctly stated the amount of tonnage passing through that river; but in 1914 it amounted to 46,000,000 tons, valued at \$1,500,000,000. It does seem to me, and I think it should seem to every impartial observer, that a river of national importance, carrying that amount of trade and commerce, should not be denied the comparatively small appropriation provided for in the House bill.

We are told that among other considerations that influenced the committee they were in doubt as to whether they might not be committing themselves to a twenty-million or a thirty-million project. The fact is, this immediate proposition is absolutely divorced from any project. You are not passing on any proposition other than the simple one: "Are you prepared to devote \$200,000 of the public money for a vital improvement close to the greatest navy yard we have in the country? Are you going to take the counsel of your Executive and of the head of your Navy Department, both of whom state that this is absolutely essential?"

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the Senator that I am moved to ask the question I expect to propound solely with the object of bringing out the facts surrounding this proposition.

I want to ask the Senator what his judgment is in regard to what I understood the Senator from Arkansas to claim—that the expenditure of the money provided for in this item would necessarily lead to the expenditure of \$29,000,000, I think it was?

Mr. O'GORMAN. No; I think the Senator from Arkansas, if he desired to be so understood, was mistaken, because the House provision expressly declares:

That nothing herein contained shall be construed as adopting the said project—

And "the said project" refers to one of those alluded to by the chairman of the committee—

beyond the work to the extent and in the manner specified.

I should like to direct the thought of the Senate to this immediate proposition. This Diamond Reef obstruction is in the direct course of navigation leading into the navy yard, and the water at that point is less than 35 feet deep. These large battleships now being built there and that have been built and that pass in and out now draw 30 and 31 feet of water; and, as has been testified by one of the admirals before the House committee, he never passes through that section of the East River without the gravest anxiety as to a possible injury to his ship for which we are expending in these days from fifteen to eighteen million dollars.

Mr. NORRIS. The question I really wanted the Senator to answer was whether or not, in his judgment, the expenditure of the money provided for in this item would, in order to make it useful, necessitate the expenditure of the additional sum mentioned by the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. O'GORMAN. No; I do not think so. I do not think it would follow at all. My impression is that this immediate appropriation would go very far toward reducing the Diamond Reef and removing it as an obstruction.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the proposition that is going to cost \$29,000,000 to which the Senator from Arkansas refers?

Mr. O'GORMAN. There are two propositions, rather comprehensive, but not necessarily affecting this immediate improvement that we are asking now. As I have said, that is apparent from the circumstance that in the House provision there is an express declaration that this appropriation is not to be regarded as an adoption of any project.

Mr. NORRIS. No; but, of course, a declaration in the law does not necessarily mean that it would not follow that such a thing might be necessary. I wanted to know what the facts were. Would this expenditure be useless if we did not go further and expend the additional money?

Mr. O'GORMAN. I think not. Indeed, I am sure it would not.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator to discuss, at some time when he has the floor, the proposition—and I ask this question with the same motives—of what is known as the Buttermilk Channel, as I believe it is called.

Mr. O'GORMAN. That is one of the propositions, but that is not before this body.

Mr. NORRIS. Does this mean that that improvement would be rejected if we adopted this? Is this connected with that proposition in any way?

Mr. O'GORMAN. This does not adopt any project. It is a simple, concrete proposition. It is necessary to expend \$200,000 to make a needed improvement in the East River in close proximity to the navy yard. The question is, Will the Senate of the United States refuse it—refuse it to a State that is contributing 25 per cent of every dollar paid out of the Federal Treasury for public improvements in every part of the Union? I do not think it is fair that such a disposition should be manifested.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator to get the idea that I am propounding these questions in any spirit of hostility but without knowing all the facts I feel inclined to vote to retain this item in the bill, and the Senator has presented certain propositions that I think are worthy of consideration. I am trying to get information so as to vote intelligently.

Mr. O'GORMAN. The Senator referred to two propositions not before us. Both of them are found in House or Senate documents, which, of course, are accessible to any Senator who cares to read them. Mr. President, I believe on the merits that this proposition should be favored; it should have the approval of the Senate. I am not without appreciation of the other reasons offered by the chairman of the committee. He is a Senator of great experience. He knows better than a good many of us how to secure legislation. He knows the best methods to be employed, and I have no doubt from his viewpoint he is pursuing the very best course looking ultimately to the welfare of the country.

But I prefer not to be involved in those collateral considerations. I base my contention as to the propriety of this appropriation on its merits, divorced from all other propositions that came before the committee or that may come before the Senate. It is not to be supposed that this is of no more importance than the 15 or 20 other projects alluded to by the Senator from Arkansas. The President of the United States, at a time when he is endeavoring with the aid of Congress to formulate a preparedness program, advises us that he believes it essential to have this appropriation and to have this improvement. If his judgment is good in this respect I think the Senate ought to reinstate the House provision, and I think in reinstating it the plans the Senator from Arkansas has with regard to these other meritorious provisions will not necessarily suffer. With his powerful capacity for persuading, I have no doubt when he goes into a meeting with the House conferees he will be able to satisfy them that the best interests of the country will be served by yielding to every proposition he makes with respect to these public improvements.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, when this bill was reported from the committee, I as a member of the committee reserved the right, while favoring the report, to vote in opposition to certain items of the bill of which I did not approve. The rejection of the East River proposition was one of the items that I had in mind. I do not think, and I so expressed it to the committee, that a matter vitally affecting the importance of the greatest harbor in the country and one of the greatest in the world should be made a trading point between the two Houses of Congress. It is no secret that this proposition on its merits met with favor on the part of a majority of the committee.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator was there any difference of opinion as to the real merits of the proposition?

Mr. OLIVER. Not so far as I can remember. I do not remember that a single member of the committee expressed himself in opposition to this proposition.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask a further question? Was there any different opinion expressed by any witness who came before the committee on the subject?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think there was any hearing on this item.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. There were no witnesses.

Mr. OLIVER. There was no hearing at all. The discussion was confined entirely to the members of the committee sitting in executive session. I will say, however, that in rejecting this proposition a very respectable minority of the committee voted in favor of retaining it.

For this reason, Mr. President, I feel constrained to differ from my associates on the committee, and I think that on the merits of the proposition it is undeniable that we ought to retain it and let the amendments reported by the committee which relate to new projects stand upon their own merits when the bill comes into conference.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, while the utterances made thus far in the discussion of this item have been highly entertaining, particularly the statement of the chairman of the committee, fortified by the statement of the Senator from Minnesota with respect to at least one exceedingly important motive for the rejection of this item by the Senate Committee on Commerce, that motive has become so clear to the Senate, and it is so thoroughly understood by every Member of the body that I shall not make any further observations in connection with it. I do, however, desire to bring to the attention of the Senate some phases of this matter which I think are of importance by way of supplementing the remarks of my colleague, the senior Senator from New York.

I hope it will not be considered that the State of New York is asking for this item as a State, that the city of New York is here asking the Federal Government to expend \$200,000 this year and \$500,000 next year for the completion of this particular piece of work.

I need not say that the expenditure under Government contract of \$700,000 and the subsequent expenditure of that sum by a contractor, in the space of two years, in the work of improving a portion of the harbor of New York is of very little importance, comparatively, to the people of that city in their capacity as citizens of that city or in their capacity as citizens of the State of New York. Neither my colleague nor myself ask this for the State of New York or for the city, but we do ask the Senate to take into consideration a condition of affairs which can not be ignored.

By an accident of geography and by the remarkable facilities afforded by nature at the mouth of the Hudson River the city of New York has become the metropolis of the United States. It has become the metropolis not only by the efforts of its inhabitants or by the efforts of the inhabitants of the State of New York, but it has become a metropolis as a result of the prosperity and the wealth and the enterprise of the entire Union, and as such it is the property of the United States. It is the pride of this country, just as Berlin is the pride of Germany, Paris of France, and London of Great Britain. Nothing that Congress can do or say can change the economic laws which make the city of New York the metropolis of the Nation and make the harbor of New York the greatest port of entry on this continent. If we place our discussion upon that plane and view the situation from that standpoint, I think we can approach it with clearer minds.

Now, it so happens that the progress of shipbuilding in recent years—particularly in the last 10 or 15 years—has resulted in this, that ships, instead of drawing 24 to 26 feet as a maximum, are now drawing 30 to 31 feet as a maximum.

That applies not only to merchant vessels, which, as my colleague has said, carry 46,000,000 tons in and out of New York every year, but also applies to battleships and armored cruisers.

Prior to this very significant increase in size and draft of ships the harbor of New York required very little improvement either at the hands of the Federal Government or of the local authorities. As a result of that situation existing prior to the increase in the size of ships, out of \$850,000,000, in round figures, which has been appropriated by the Federal Government for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country since those appropriations were first started, just about 3 per cent of that sum has been spent in the harbor of New York.

Now, the situation has commenced to change. Ships have increased in size. Every great port in the world is being seriously affected by this change in the size of ships, and every Government in the world worthy of being called a great Government has been exceedingly industrious in recent years in improving the harbors of their great seaports. This has been done in Antwerp; it has been done in Rotterdam; it has been done on the Thames; it has been done in Liverpool. Eventually it must be done in

the principal harbors of the United States; otherwise large vessels can not come to this country as they should come.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has inquired whether or not this particular item will necessarily and inevitably lead to the expenditure of \$29,000,000. The wording of the item expressly forbids any such construction being placed upon it. My colleague has read the language. The project to which he refers and to which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] refers, as I understand it, is one which has been recommended a couple or three years ago by the Army engineers for a comprehensive improvement of all New York Harbor or all those portions of the harbor which need improvement in order to enable 30-foot draft vessels to reach the docks in both the North River and the East River and to reach the docks on the Jersey side at Hoboken and Jersey City. Much of the harbor, in fact a great portion of it now, will not only carry a 30-foot draft vessel but will carry a 35-foot draft vessel, and the main channel coming in from Sandy Hook through the lower bay, known as Ambrose Channel, already contains a 40-foot depth of water.

The proposal made by the engineers, and which has not yet been adopted by Congress, and which could not be adopted under the language of this item, is that an average depth in the usable waters of the harbor of 35 feet be eventually attained, at an estimated cost, as I understand it, of about \$29,000,000.

The Senator from Nebraska has asked a question about the Buttermilk Channel and its relation to this particular improvement. At the risk of boring the Senate, but perhaps for the benefit of the Senator from Nebraska, I beg leave to point out on a map of the harbor the particular points of interest with respect to this bill.

Every Senator, I assume, of course, is familiar with Manhattan Island and the lower end of the island known as the Battery. To a ship coming in from the Atlantic and coming up the Ambrose Channel into the upper bay, we will say a battleship bound for the Brooklyn Navy Yard, which I have here indicated in solid blue [indicating], two entrances into the East River, which separates the borough of Brooklyn from Manhattan, are available.

The two entrances in the East River are separated from each other by Governors Island, which is here indicated in solid blue, and which is well known as an Army post and the headquarters of the Department of the East.

The channel at the south of Governors Island, separating Governors Island from the Brooklyn shore, is the Buttermilk Channel. The channel north of the island separating Governors Island from the Battery on Manhattan Island is the channel which is to be improved under this item.

The Senator from Arkansas has stated that two Army engineers have disagreed as to which of those two channels should be improved in order to allow a battleship to reach the Brooklyn Navy Yard with entire safety, and he has stated that the improvement of the channel between the Battery and Governors Island will cost a great deal more money than the improvement of the Buttermilk Channel south of the island.

However I call the attention of the Senate to the hearings held before the House committee, a copy of which I hold in my hand. On page 26 we have the testimony of Col. Black, of the Army Engineers, who says that to improve Buttermilk Channel to its full width, or to a width equal to the improvement now asked for the northern channel on the other side of Governors Island, would cost \$1,950,000.

Further on in his testimony he states that the initial expenditure would not be sufficient for all time, because the bottom of that channel is composed largely of mud and clay and gravel, and consequently there will always be an annual maintenance charge to keep it clear. He states that the initial expenditure will be \$1,950,000, and he estimates that the other channel, the one that is to be improved under this item, is to cost only a total of \$700,000.

So I think, with all due deference to the Senator from Arkansas, he must be mistaken as to the comparative cost of the improvement of the respective channels.

Furthermore, Col. Black says in his testimony that when Diamond Reef is blasted out of the channel between Governors Island and the Battery there will be no cost of maintenance, because it is solid rock and does not fill in again by the drifting of silt. In that respect this improvement is exceptional. Once done it is permanent.

Now, what is the situation with respect to the East River? My colleague has stated the tremendous interest of the Navy Department in having this improvement made. He has not overstated that interest. Both these channels—the one north of Governors Island contemplated for improvement and Buttermilk Channel to the south of Governors Island—to-day carry about the same depth of water, from 30 to 32 feet, 32 feet being

the maximum depth at the top of the highest tide when the wind is right. With the wind blowing in a certain direction, Admiral Benson testified before the House committee, the water is backed out of both those channels, and as a result even at the highest tide there is sometimes a reduction of 2 feet in depth due to wind action alone. Sometimes that condition continues from 24 to 48 hours, and during such a condition no battleship built or launched or used by the United States during the last 8 or 10 years can reach the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and if it is in the yard at such a time it can not get out.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. Can the Senator state how many merchant vessels now enter New York Harbor requiring a draft of 35 feet?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can not state the total number, in response to the question of the Senator from Ohio, but I will say that the North River can carry a 30-foot vessel. Improvements have been made along the North River docks, and North River, be it remembered, is the Hudson River lying between the Jersey shore and Manhattan Island. The North River now can carry a 30-foot vessel to the docks in Hoboken. The Hamburg-American Line and the North German Lloyd Line, as I remember—and my colleague will correct me if I am wrong—have their docks on the Hoboken side. The *Olympic* and the *Vaterland*, the greatest ships in the world, one White Star liner and one a German liner, can reach their Hoboken or Manhattan docks and discharge their passengers and freight. Therefore, so far as that is concerned, the west side of New York Harbor, the west fork, as it were, which presents itself to the ship coming north from Sandy Hook, can be used now by the largest boat in existence.

There are certain reaches of the river above the docks at Hoboken and Jersey City to which the ships can not go. It is the idea of the Government engineers, as I understand it, to make some further improvements in the North River, so that ships of any size can go farther north.

The same is not true of the East River. The reef between Governors Island and the Battery, which my colleague has described as Diamond Reef, and another reef just beyond it, known as Coenties Reef, limit the ships to 30-foot draft at a maximum under the most favorable conditions, so that none of the great ocean liners come into East River. They can not get into East River from Long Island Sound coming from the north on account of similar obstructions at Hell Gate, and it is the plan of the Army engineers eventually, with the consent, of course, of Congress, to blast out the reefs at Hell Gate and a few pinnacle rocks here and there in East River, so that both ends of the river will carry the largest vessel.

Two battleships have already touched bottom in this spot which it is desired to be improved, and when a battleship of 15,000 or 20,000 to 30,000 tons hits a rocky obstacle on the bottom of a stream it is an exceedingly serious matter. The momentum of a ship of that sort striking against a resisting material causes an enormous damage, and that is what gives rise to the nervousness of the navigating officers of our ships.

Furthermore, the channel between Governors Island and the Battery, which it is sought to be improved, such as it is, is not a straight channel, and the ships have to make two exceedingly sharp angle turns in a very restricted area of water. One of the turns is guided by a point on the roof of a hotel in the city of Brooklyn, situated on higher land. By ranging the roof of that hotel with a certain point down on the Brooklyn shore, the navigating officer knows he is following the turn in the channel; but Admiral Benson testified that if there was any fog on the river the shore-line point is obscured and he can not range it with the point higher up on the roof of the hotel. He has even had to back a great battleship out of the way of a tow of barges in that particularly narrow place.

The Brooklyn Navy Yard has been in existence for 100 years. The Government has spent millions and millions of dollars upon it. We build dreadnaughts there. A ship is being built there now. It is on the ways. Another battleship, having been completed so far as its hull is concerned, is being outfitted there. It is well to remember that the Brooklyn Navy Yard is the one navy yard above all others in the United States which is used for the outfitting of battleships, the placing of guns on board, the movable equipment. It has been the custom of the Navy Department to base, as it is called, four or five or six battleships on the New York Navy Yard. When a new ship is built and added to the Navy, they take the oldest of the battleships which have been based on the New York Navy Yard and base them on the Philadelphia or Norfolk or some other yard, always leaving four or five or six battleships based upon New York.

The situation is an exceedingly serious one. We have embarked on building these big ships, and we must continue it if we are to maintain our own in competition with others, even if we do not intend to compete with them to the limit. It strikes me, as it must strike every Senator who takes this matter seriously, that for us to leave a situation of that sort which at some time may lock up two or three battleships in the Brooklyn Navy Yard without their being able to get out or at any moment may prevent two or three battleships getting in is a matter of far greater importance to this country than the mere matter of hampering the legislative independence of the Senate in its dealings with the House.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator further how many battleships we have now with a draft of 35 feet?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have no battleships of more than 30-foot draft. But all harbor work in these modern days is being done on a basis of 35 feet depth of water. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] reminds me. Ships like the *Utah*, the *Wyoming*, the *Arkansas*, the *Arizona*, the *California*, and No. 43 and No. 44, now building, draw 30 feet and can not get in and out of that channel unless the conditions are absolutely normal in every respect, and then they have only a few inches to spare under their bottoms.

May I call the attention of the Senate to a very possible contingency? If one of our battleships in time of war should suffer an injury below the water line, which resulted in filling with water some of the water-tight compartments, she could not get to the Brooklyn Navy Yard dry dock to be repaired, and that is one of the few dry docks which will contain a modern dreadnaught. An injury below the water line, as is well known, will settle a battleship by the head or by the stern 18 inches or 2 feet. She can be kept afloat indefinitely by keeping the water-tight compartments closed and the pumps going; but she is disabled in her fighting capacity. If that should happen in time of war outside of New York Harbor in some contest between an American fleet and a foreign fleet, the injured American battleship could not be repaired, for she could not get into the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Mr. President, I have attempted to point out, in a somewhat rambling way, what I believe is the national importance of this improvement, and for one, with all due deference to my colleagues, and particularly to the members of this committee, I must utter a protest against placing this item in the category already described in this debate. It is too important; it should not be trifled with; it is just as important to the people of the Middle West and of the Pacific coast as it is to the people of New York. That contention has, in effect, been made by the President of the United States, when he said it is of national importance, affecting our self-defense; it has been made by the Secretary of the Navy in a communication to the House committee; and it strikes me that the Senate would not be true to its traditions as a deliberative body, having in mind the good of the country—not merely the needs of New York—it seems to me that the Senate would not be true to its functions as the upper House of Congress if it did not correct what I believe to be an error on the part of this committee in striking out this item. For, Mr. President, while we have obtained some assurances with respect to the striking out of this item, and some intimation is made that it may go back in conference, I for one, as a Senator, am not willing to approach this project on that basis. I have not entire confidence in what the House of Representatives, through its conferees, will do upon this item. The House has passed it; it now comes before the Senate, just as it should come before the Senate, on its merits. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not agree to the amendment of the committee which strikes out this item.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, as a member of the Commerce Committee, I feel deeply hurt by the reflection of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] as to the consideration or lack of consideration of this matter by that committee. I think probably the Committee on Commerce gave nearly five minutes' attention to this important item. Some of us on the committee who tried to find out the reasons for striking out this item, heard the suggestion, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has here stated, in the frank and honest way that he always states the truth, that this was eliminated for trading purposes. When you say that you state the vice of this whole system that some of us have been fighting.

These propositions ought to stand upon their merit, or they ought to go down upon their demerits, as great national propositions of commerce or navigation or of preparedness, and not on their merit as trading propositions. I voted for this item in the committee; I shall vote for it on the floor, and hope it

may be restored to the bill, because it is a meritorious proposition.

While I have as great respect for the chairman of this committee as any man could have for another man, I do not believe that the chairman of the committee needs this for trading purposes. We know him well enough to know that if he can not persuade the conferees he can very quickly overrule any objection which they may make. He can swing the big stick very effectively.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, would it not be a fairer way for the Senator from Iowa to state it, to say that we are not at liberty, under present understandings of the rules, to consider the merits of the different propositions with reference to this bill; that we are confronted by a prohibition against including any new items in it?

Mr. KENYON. We have included new items in it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We are insisting that if any new items go into the bill they ought all to be considered on the same footing, so that their comparative merits might be considered at the same time on an equal footing. The Senator may call that "trading" if he wants to.

Mr. KENYON. And every other proposition in this bill we have been insisting ought to be considered on its merits. If Congress has reached the point that great questions of this character, entering into the question of preparedness, are to be considered as trading propositions, the sooner the country finds it out the better. And when it does find it out the rebuke will be quick.

I do not think this is a proposition merely for New York, as the Senator from New York has well said. It is a proposition in which the whole country is interested; it is a proposition in which the people of the West, of the Middle West, and of the South are interested; it is a proposition that the President of the United States considered so important that he asked the House committee to insert it in the bill.

I am one of those who glory in the progress of New York—of the city of New York and of the State of New York. We of the Middle West are proud of New York. Their progress is our progress; their pride is our pride. The fact that New York is a great, rich, prosperous city is a matter in which we all rejoice. Sometimes it seems as if they had almost a surplus of good things; even now they have three candidates for President. I wish they might eliminate some of them.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], however, has told us this afternoon that we need not talk about any preparedness if we are to neglect the streams in this country. New York is for preparedness. Of course the people of New York are, perhaps, not apprehensive; but this is not for their particular benefit; it is for the benefit of the entire country. They must realize, however, that if trouble comes, if war comes, if they are attacked by foreign foes, they can, perhaps, get away and go down along the Anclote, and some of them take the one launch that goes up the Anclote, or perhaps grasp the trees that twine above the Orange or the Oklawaha Rivers, and thus evade hostile submarines. This is not a New York proposition entirely; it is for the whole country, and certainly is a meritorious one.

Mr. President, I do not understand why we can not as a Senate, as a Congress, be broad enough and fair enough to take up each proposition and decide it on its merits; cut out the bad propositions and keep the good ones, and stop this legislative trading. Believing this to be one of the good and meritorious ones, I shall vote for it when the opportunity to do so arrives.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if this were a local improvement, I should say nothing about it, as I have kept silent on the many interesting local improvements of which this bill is full. I should be more than content to leave it in the very able and competent hands of the two Senators from New York; but, to my mind, it is in no sense a local improvement. To the people of the city of New York, vast as it is, and the great population of the State of New York, the expenditure of \$200,000 on this channel in the next year is a matter of very little moment. The great majority of them will never know it is being done. This, however, is a wholly national question, as I look at it.

New York is the great gateway through which pour the bulk of the exports and the imports of the United States. It is to the interest of everybody in the United States that that gateway should be made as commodious as possible. Everyone throughout the United States benefits directly or indirectly by the condition of the harbor of New York. That is the commercial reason; but in this case with the commercial reason is associated the military reason or the naval reason. It is the site of one of our great navy yards—our greatest navy yard—and

it is of immense importance to the defense of this country to have it readily open for our battleships, which are constantly growing in size and draft. It is now dangerous to take them there. Their approach to the yard and their departure from it ought to be made as safe as possible, so that our ships may pass in and out at all stages of water. It seems to me perfectly clear that this is perhaps the most important item nationally in the bill.

I want to say, in conclusion, a single word about the rule or law which has come into being about putting no new project in the bill. If this is a new project, it must have got into the bill in the other House, despite the law; but I am informed that what is called the "rule against new projects" is established by vote of the House. Mr. President, I am not one of those who are prepared as yet to accept the proposition that we have not an equal right with the other House to decide on any bill or on what shall be in any bill. The fact that the other House adopts a rule about new projects does not seem to me to have any bearing as to the action of the Senate of the United States.

Projects ought to go into this bill on their merits, and there is no use in holding up the bugbear of losing the bill because we put into it this or any other new project. As a matter of fact, this project was put in by the other House, and all we are asked to do is to keep it in.

Let me say to the Senate that, whatever else may happen, nothing will persuade the House of Representatives to allow this bill to fail. This bill is in no danger of failure. No river and harbor bill that I have ever seen ever was in danger of failure in conference. I have seen one or two river and harbor bills perish on the floor of the Senate, but never in conference. I think we may dismiss from our minds any apprehension of that kind. Judging this item, as the House put it in originally on its merits—and we have no other way to judge it here—judging it on its merits, there could not be a more meritorious proposition than this, for it is of great national importance. It affects us commercially and in a military way, and it affects not the port of New York alone, not the people of New York alone, but the commerce and the naval protection of the entire country.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I am only going to detain the Senate for a few moments. I shall do that for fear my attitude may be misunderstood. The questions I have propounded to the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], which were also referred to by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], might have created the impression that because I am hostile to the bill itself, and have expressed myself to-day at some length upon it, I would be opposed to putting any items into the bill which I could be instrumental in any way in keeping out; but, Mr. President, I am just as anxious to get good items in this bill as I am anxious to get bad items out.

I have not the expert knowledge to enable me to say that I understand all of the items contained in the bill, meritorious and otherwise; but, so far as my limited knowledge goes, I believe this is the most important of any of the items contained in this bill. I think it is national in its character, and I believe every other item ought to be, to a great extent, a national item.

We are all interested in every one of our great ports and we are all interested, although in a lesser degree, in the smaller ports. We ought to be interested in anything that tends to build up the commerce of the country, regardless of location. I would not draw—and I hope I do not draw—in my consideration of the questions involved, any State line. The harbor of New York ought to be improved.

I wanted to say these few words for another reason, because, aside from its commercial possibilities and its commercial importance, the improvement covered by the amendment under consideration is a military necessity, and I wanted to make my position plain, because I have so often been quoted as one who was opposed to any consideration being given to anything along military lines, when, as a matter of fact, I have felt the same way about that question as I have about the river and harbor bill. While I do not agree with many great men, some of them being amongst my best friends, that there is a great necessity for extreme military development at the present time, I am anxious that any matter relating to military preparedness which, in my judgment, is reasonable and fair should be looked after and attended to properly.

It goes without saying that when we have a navy yard—if we were going to locate it now, it might be a different proposition—but when we have already located in the harbor of New York, and have maintained there for about 100 years, the greatest of all navy yards in this country, and when, on account of the increasing size of vessels which we have been building and are building for the Navy, it is practically an impossi-

bility for our ships to get in or get out, I think, as a military proposition, this improvement ought to be made. I am therefore in favor of it under almost any considerations; but there is another reason why I am in favor of it.

It has been said that the item was put in the bill for trading purposes, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] intimated that some one had claimed that if we left this item stand the bill might fail. To my mind that is a very good reason why we ought to leave it in. If this bill, at least in its present form, can be made to fail by including any item, I would be glad to put it in the bill, and thus kill the bill, and then vote for a provision such as is contained in the amendment under discussion as a separate and independent matter. It is bad legislation, as I look at it, to put anything in a bill or to strike anything out of any bill for trading purposes.

There are other new items which have been incorporated in this bill by the Senate committee. I have not examined in detail all of them, but, for the purpose of the argument, I want to assume that at least some of them are meritorious and ought to be included in the bill. As I understand, however, the committee fears that the House will not agree to them unless the Senate conferees are able to say "We will keep the New York item out if you do not let these others in." If our committee have anything "up their sleeve" which is not meritorious, we ought not to give them that leverage, and if they have inserted some new item which is meritorious and which ought to be included in the bill, and it shall pass the Senate, then they do not need any leverage. It will stand on its own merits. If it is desired to add some other new and meritorious item, and if there is such a rule as that to which reference has been made, that nothing new shall be done under the sun, the House having violated that rule by putting in this meritorious item, there is no reason why the Senate should not also violate it. The pot could not call the kettle black in that instance, because the other body has already violated that rule, if there is such a rule; and if there is such a rule, it is not of any consequence, anyway, for there is no reason, if we want to legislate for the benefit of the entire country and we find a proposition that is meritorious—one that is going to be beneficial to the people of the country—why it should not be put in the bill, whether it is a child or whether it is hoary and gray haired and baldheaded with age. If it has merit, we ought to provide for it; and if it has not merit, it ought to be kept out.

So it seems to me, from any viewpoint, that this item ought to stay in the bill. It is of just as much interest to the people of the West as it is to the people of the East. They are just as anxious to protect the battleships which we have as are the people of New York. They are just as anxious that our battleships should have a harbor of safety as are the people of the cities of the Atlantic coast, and that, too, without regard to whether they believe that we ought to build a hundred battleships in the next six months and bankrupt the country by the expenditure of all the money which we can borrow everywhere to build battleships and provide armies, or whether they believe that there is not any demand or necessity for any increase of any kind. No matter what extreme you take, here is a proposition, it seems to me, that should appeal to all patriotic citizens, regardless of their belief upon that question, because no one wants to take a battleship now under our flag and prevent it from getting into a navy yard already established if, by the expenditure of a reasonable amount of money, we can make provision that the ship may have access to and egress from such yard.

I am glad of an opportunity to support this item, Mr. President. I wish that every other item in the bill had behind it the broad, patriotic reasons which, it seems to me, are behind this item.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Commerce, I also reserved the right to vote for or against any item that might be in the bill and concerning which there might be controversy in the Senate. I think every member of the committee has that right, whether he expressly reserved it or not. I am not going to discuss the general features of the bill, except simply to say that I concur with all those who say that every item ought to be considered on its merits. I do not suppose there is a Senator here who will deny that.

Mr. President, with reference to this particular item, I have really been amused at the solemnity and earnestness with which the able Senators from New York have come to the defense of New York, and have so vigorously assured us that it is a great city. I really thought that it was before I heard this discussion. I think that the country generally recognizes that it is a great city. I think that everybody recognizes that the harbor of New York is more than a local harbor; that it is of national importance; that its development is of great benefit

to all the country; and I am not surprised that there is such a strong sentiment in favor of this amendment. Of course, whenever the Senator from New York reads that the commerce in a certain channel is 46,000,000 tons a year and that they want additional sums to further improve the harbor, it very strongly appeals not only to the Senate but to the whole country.

The worst thing about this item is the way it got into the bill. My friend from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] talks about these items being considered on their merits. This item was not put in this bill on its merits at all. The merits of the item, as a matter of fact, had nothing to do with getting it in the bill. As I understand the senior Senator from New York, he said that this item was included in this bill by the unanimous vote of the House. I should like to ask the Senator whether I was mistaken in that?

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President, the matter was taken up by the committee on the President's suggestion, and the hearings ordered by unanimous consent of the House. It is only to that extent that I meant to be understood.

Mr. JONES. Well, Mr. President, the House does not direct hearings before the River and Harbor Committee; the River and Harbor Committee had its hearings. That is true; but, Mr. President, this is the only item in this bill that led to a minority report on the bill signed by every member of the minority on that committee.

I want simply to call attention to these facts. I am going to vote for this item, so far as that is concerned—I will say that now—but I do say the method and manner in which the item was incorporated in this bill is most reprehensible.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I know the Senator would be glad to have his facts stated accurately. All the minority members did not vote against this provision, but only five out of eight voted that way. That is my information.

Mr. JONES. Well, I have the record here, I will say to the Senator, and I will point out to the Senator wherein he is mistaken. I have here the minority report of the committee submitted to the House of Representatives. It speaks for itself, and it is signed by six members.

Mr. O'GORMAN. There are eight members altogether of the minority on the committee.

Mr. JONES. Then I am mistaken in that. There are eight members of the committee, and there were six who signed the minority report. I thank the Senator for making that correction. The minority was not unanimous, but six constitutes a large part of the minority; but that does not make any difference anyhow. It does not make any difference if there had been only one member of the minority who signed the report. I want to call attention to how this item got in this bill.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors in the House of Representatives adopted a rule that it would not insert any new items in the bill which it was going to frame. It did that, according to this minority report, not only because of the views of the committee itself but at the request of the President of the United States. This is what the minority report says:

The committee voted that owing to the condition of the National Treasury and in compliance with the wishes of the President no new project should be carried in the bill.

I have nothing to say as to the wisdom of that rule; but, nevertheless, the committee adopted it and said, "That is the rule we are going to follow," and the House of Representatives indorsed the committee in that rule in every respect. They did not include in the bill any new projects except this one; and they adopted that rule not only because of their views as to what ought to be done but at the request of the President of the United States.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Senator say the committee passed a rule in the language which he has just read?

Mr. JONES. This is what the minority say in their minority report, and I think we have a right to assume that it is so. It is common knowledge that that is so; that they did pass a rule of that character and absolutely adhered to it.

Mr. HUGHES. It is common knowledge that it is not true, and that is the reason I wanted to correct the Senator. It is common knowledge—

Mr. JONES. The Senator can not correct me in that way.

Mr. HUGHES. It is common knowledge that it is not true, and that the committee never passed any such rule.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not yield to the Senator for that purpose. I have my opinion and he has his. There is no question, so far as that is concerned, but that the committee did adopt that rule. They may not have written it out, but they adopted that rule, and they have followed that rule all the way through except on this one item.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, does the Senator say they adopted that rule at the request of the President?

Mr. JONES. I read from the minority report. I am not a member of the committee over there and I was not in its deliberations. Every one of the members signed that statement.

Mr. KENYON. If they adopted the rule at the request of the President, then why would not they adopt the exception at the request of the President?

Mr. JONES. That is exactly what they did, and that is what I am going to show in a minute. That is exactly what they did, and that is what I object to. That is the objectionable feature about this item. The Senator does not approve of that way of getting items in the bill?

Mr. KENYON. No; Mr. President, but I am willing to take the judgment of the President of the United States.

Mr. JONES. Oh, yes. Let me show what he based his judgment on, however, and then I will ask the Senator whether he is willing to take his judgment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. What on earth has a rule of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors to do with our action? How does it concern us?

Mr. JONES. Oh, well, it has not anything to do with our action, except that it does have something to do with how we shall treat items put in the bill by the House and how we shall govern ourselves in the way we think is best with reference to our bill. As I stated a moment ago, I expect to vote for this item; but while certain Senators are denouncing this measure, I do want to show how some of these items that are really meritorious get in here. That is what I want to show. It shows that there are objectionable features outside of those that have been pointed out with reference to the making up of these bills.

As I say, the House committee followed this rule, and they refused to put this item in the bill because of this rule; and then a letter was sent to the President by a Member of the House in which he said to the President what I am about to read. Here are the reasons why he said this item should be put in. He did not talk about its commercial importance. He did not talk about the really great importance and the essential need of it from a preparedness standpoint; but he said this:

The Representatives from New York will be placed in an impossible position if they support revenue measures which will largely increase the burdens of their constituents while failing to obtain legislation deemed essential for the security of the metropolis of the Nation.

That is nothing more nor less than a hold-up proposition. That is all it is. It is a notification to the President that "if you do not help us get this item in this bill, you can not command our support on your revenue legislation."

Now, some may draw other inferences from that language, but it seems to me that it is perfectly plain. They wanted the President to help them out, and that is the reason they give for it. They do not point out the great commerce carried in this channel. They do not point out these obstructions that are in it. They do not say anything about the navy yard or anything of that sort; but they insist upon his helping them, or else his revenue propositions are not meritorious, are not deserving of support. That is what it means.

There were some references in the debate awhile ago to items put in this bill that have been put in to help Congressmen. Why, that is exactly the reason why this item is put in here. That is perfectly plain. It was put in here for the purpose of helping Representatives. That is true regardless of its merits. It ought to have stood on its merits, but it did not. It was not put in here on its merits.

They say that the President says it is essential to national preparedness, and they say we ought to take the President's judgment. He never sent any message down to us. He never sent any message to Congress pointing out the importance of the improvement of this great channel for the great city of New York, which belongs to the Nation and not to the people of New York. What did he say in answer to this letter? Why, apparently he did not consider it of sufficient importance to sign a letter himself, but he directed his secretary to address a

letter to the chairman of the committee, and this is what he said:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 11, 1916.

MY DEAR MR. SPARKMAN: The President directs me to say to you that he is strongly of the opinion that the pending river and harbor bill should carry an appropriation for the immediate improvement of the East River adjacent to the Brooklyn Navy Yard. He fully appreciates the fact that this would be—

I want to call this to the attention of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES]. Listen to what the President says in this letter, through his secretary—

He fully appreciates the fact that this would be contrary to the rule of the committee not to recommend appropriations for new projects at this time, but he feels that the importance of the matter in its relation to the question of national preparedness fully justifies an exception to the rule.

The President understands that Secretary Daniels has fully explained this matter to the committee.

Sincerely, yours,

J. P. TUMULTY,
Secretary to the President.

Mr. KENYON. What are the dates of those letters?

Mr. JONES. This letter is dated February 11, 1916. The date of the letter from the Congressman is not given here, but I suppose it is in the hearing.

The President, through his Secretary, does not give any special facts or special reasons why this item should be taken out of the rule adopted by the committee. If it is so important from a preparedness standpoint, he ought to submit to Congress a statement of the need for it.

Practically all the argument that has been presented on this floor to-day has been from the standpoint of the necessity of this improvement for the navy yard. Grant it; grant that it is necessary in order to get battleships up to the navy yard, and grant that we ought to get the battleships up there, and that we ought to have the channel. That could very properly, under the rules of the Senate and under the practices of the Senate, be taken care of in the naval appropriation bill, where it ought to be taken care of.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me?

Mr. JONES. Certainly.

Mr. STONE. The Senator, as I understood, expressed himself as being in favor of this item.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. STONE. And yet he is making a very vigorous speech in opposition to it.

Mr. JONES. Oh, no.

Mr. STONE. I do not quite understand the attitude of the Senator.

Mr. JONES. Why, my attitude is very plain. I am opposed to the methods by which it got into the bill. The item is all right, but it did not get in here right.

Mr. STONE. Ought it to go out on that account?

Mr. JONES. No; it ought not; and I am not going to vote to have it go out; but I am going to call attention to how it got in, in the hope that in the future other items will not get in in the same way.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on the matter of appropriating on naval bills, I have been on the Naval Committees in both Houses, and I have been for a good many years on the Naval Committee of the Senate. We could not put any such item as this in the naval bill.

Mr. JONES. Why not?

Mr. LODGE. Because it has nothing immediately to do with the navy yard. It is the approach to the navy yard. If the naval bill could be used in that way, you would have harbor improvements all over this country in the naval bill.

Mr. JONES. Yes, Mr. President; and if every river and harbor bill can be used in this way, you will have appropriations for all the navy yards in the country made in this same way.

Mr. LODGE. This is part of the general harbor of New York. It is some distance from the actual yard, and it is useful for commercial as well as military purposes. We never put such items as this in the naval bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I am going to touch on that matter, and I will do it right now. Why, the very language of this item shows that it is not put in here for commercial purposes. It is not a commercial item, and the Senators from New York have expressly said that it is not the beginning of any project; but the language of the item itself excludes that. It is solely for the purpose of getting up to the navy yard; and I venture to say that there is not any rule of the Senate or of any committee that would prevent the inclusion in the naval bill of any item necessary in order to secure an approach to any navy yard in the country. If there were any such rule, it would soon be done away with.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is not any question of the commercial value of this—none whatever. A very large commerce goes by there, and it is very essential to commerce. I will say that out of my own knowledge.

Mr. JONES. Why, Mr. President, according to the report they have a channel 26 feet deep all through this stretch of water—I do not know just what they call it—through which the great commerce that the Senator from New York has pointed out, 46,000,000 tons, is already going. There is not anything here that will show that there will be a through channel for commercial vessels drawing 35 feet—not a bit of it. There are other obstructions outside of the approach to the navy yard.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

Mr. JONES. If you take this from a commercial standpoint—and I wish the Senator from Nebraska were here—I want to call his attention to the fact that if you take it on that theory it is the beginning of a \$13,000,000 project, and possible a \$32,000,000 project.

I now yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, with respect to the statement just made by the Senator from Washington, to the effect that the removal of this reef will not accomplish anything for commerce—

Mr. JONES. Oh, I did not say it would not accomplish anything; practically nothing, though, for the great through commerce going through there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I remind the Senator from Washington that this particular reef is the only obstacle at the mouth of the East River which prevents vessels of 35 feet draft from sailing up and into the East River to the Manhattan and Brooklyn docks. They can not get out of the East River at the northern end on account of similar reefs at Hell Gate; but commercial vessels may use all of the East River if this reef is removed.

Mr. JONES. Does the Senator say that they will use that channel to any very great extent if no further improvement is made?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Why, certainly.

Mr. JONES. Then, why did they put this limitation in here?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I did not draft the item. It was drafted in the House.

Mr. JONES. No; I judge not. We have to judge this item largely by its language. This is specifically put upon the ground of getting it in for the navy yard. Of course, the real purpose of it is set out in the letter from the Congressman.

With reference to this project, I want to call attention to the report of the engineers. The district officer recommended a project that would cost \$32,000,000 and over. The total cost would be \$32,533,501. The Board of Engineers did not think that the commerce, even of the great city of New York, warranted that increased expenditure, and they said so, and they modified that proposition in the recommendation of the local engineer, and they recommended a project like this for the East River:

The board reports that in its opinion it is not advisable for the United States to undertake any further improvement at this time of Little Hell Gate, New York, but it is advisable for the United States to undertake additional improvement of East River, N. Y., as follows:

Then they give one item that will cost \$8,616,780. The \$700,000 provided in this bill will not do that, and they say that is necessary. This item will not do that. Then there is another item to give access to the wharves that would cost \$2,129,458. This will not do that. Then there is the east channel, which will cost in round numbers \$13,400,000. Then they say:

The work should be prosecuted—

I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to this proposition, as bearing upon some of the general criticisms he is making with reference to these bills. They recommend as follows:

The work should be prosecuted at such a rate as appropriations will permit, it being desirable to have at least \$500,000 provided annually for this purpose, the application of the funds supplied being left to the discretion of the Chief of Engineers, so that the work may be carried on at such points and in such order as may best serve the interests of navigation.

According to that, they have a project to cost over \$13,000,000. At the rate of \$500,000 a year, it would be 26 years before they would get it done. That is what we are starting on, if we take the view that this is a commercial proposition. We are starting on a thirteen million dollar project that they do not expect to have finished for 26 years.

I should like to see the Senators from New York, if they stand on this as a commercial proposition, urging that we appropriate enough money to begin the work and authorize contracts to finish it and get it done. That is the great wasteful feature in the river and harbor work that we have done heretofore. I agree with the Senator from Iowa that we have been dribbling along in these projects for years and years and quarters of cen-

turies, and we have wasted more money than would be necessary to finish the projects if we had appropriated all of it or made it available so that they could carry out the projects.

That is what this is the beginning of, if it is taken as a commercial proposition. I do not say it is not advisable to take it up as a commercial proposition. I think it is. I agree with the Senators from New York that the harbor of New York can not be made too good, and that it ought to be made so that it will accommodate the largest possible ships that are going to be constructed in the years to come, so as to accommodate this great commerce, which is the commerce of the country, and not simply the commerce of the city of New York.

Mr. President, I simply wanted to call attention to the manner in which this item got in here. As I said at the beginning, that is the worst objection to it—the manner of it getting in. Of course, we need not be controlled by the action of the House; and yet this is urged on the ground of preparedness, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] urges it on the ground of preparedness. If it is necessary for preparedness, that is all right; but that, again, is another argument why it should be in the naval bill. The river and harbor bill is not a military preparedness measure. It is an industrial preparedness measure, if you want to put it on that ground. Of course, everything that anybody wants now is put on the ground of preparedness, and that seems to be a sufficient argument to present for a great many of these things. This river and harbor bill and the different items in it are not being pressed and have not been pressed, however, on the ground even of industrial preparedness, although that is the line of work that should be carried on by this bill. But if this is an item of military or war preparedness, it certainly should be very properly in one of the war bills—either the naval bill or the military bill—which ever you want to put it in.

Of course, if you connect it up with a commercial proposition, why, all right; but when you connect it up with a commercial proposition I want you to understand what you are doing. You are connecting it up with a \$13,000,000 proposition, and possibly a \$30,000,000 proposition, that may take, and with the dribbling policy suggested in this report will take, from 26 to 30 years; and if you take the \$32,000,000 proposition that would be 64 years. If we are going to take it up as a commercial proposition, we ought to take it up earnestly and do what is necessary to be done to complete it in the proper time.

As I said, I am going to vote for this item because it is needed both as a commercial proposition and as a naval proposition, but I am not voting to put it on because it really is entitled to be put on here on the basis of a naval proposition. It ought to have been put on the naval bill. That is where it ought to go. The main thing I wanted to call attention to was the methods used to put it on, which, in my judgment, are just as reprehensible, if not more reprehensible, than to put an improper item in the bill in the proper way.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce has fully accomplished the purpose it had in view in presenting this item by eliciting the discussion which has followed. I want to advise the Senate that the committee rested under no delusion about what it was doing and what will be done in this matter. Those of the members of the committee who informed themselves, as all members of the committees should, as to what they were doing knew exactly what was involved in this matter and acted with a perfect understanding of that fact. It is a deliberate attempt to capitalize the clamor in the country in favor of this so-called preparedness policy by the usual plan of first taking the most attractive and the most defensible item in a larger project and adopting it.

This particular East River project has been recommended for the last three years. The first report, the one recommending the Buttermilk Channel, was filed with Congress on May 3, 1913. There is a full discussion in that report of the relative merits of the two channels, and the then Chief of Engineers recommended the Buttermilk Channel in competition with this East River Channel as being not only the better one of the two but the cheaper. The report is accompanied by an approving report from the General Board of Naval Advisers headed by Admiral Dewey, in which the opinion is expressed that for the purpose of reaching the Brooklyn Navy Yard the Buttermilk Channel is the proper one. This report, recommending the larger project, was made by another division engineer and approved by another board of engineers a short time thereafter.

The project reported in the larger and more comprehensive report, known as Document No. 188, Sixty-third Congress, first session, was filed on the 7th of August, 1913. On its merits neither of these propositions commended itself sufficiently to the River and Harbor Committee of the House or the Senate Committee on Commerce to justify its being included in any one of the three

bills that have been prepared during the time that has intervened. It was not in either of the bills that failed during the last two sessions of Congress. Just at this time it seems to take on a new significance, and a misleading nominal appropriation is provided for it. The scope of the project is cut in two, and the proposition is coolly made to make one end of it 35 feet deep, under the safe assumption that hereafter an argument will thereby be furnished in favor of extending the whole system.

So far as I am concerned, I am not opposed to adopting the entire project, with the \$29,000,000 in it, if it is necessary to do so; but I do not care to have it adopted by this process of indirection.

In recommending the rejection of the item we were not dealing with the item primarily. We were dealing with the policy as to whether or not other new items should go into this bill. The Senate Committee on Commerce felt that the Senate was an independent part of the legislative branch of this Government and had a right to exercise its judgment about what should be included in matters of legislation to which its assent is required; and in the exercise of that judgment it included some 15 or 20 items, aggregating an outlay of some \$3,000,000 as against about \$40,000,000 included in the bill by the House before it came to us. We thought that as there was so much dispute among professional men with reference to a choice between these two channels, we were well within our rights when we submitted that matter again to legislative inquiry. When we come to be confronted with an arbitrary, cast-iron rule when we go into conference we thought we were still within our rights when we could say, "If that is the rule for one item it should be the rule for another of equal merits."

I say to you that this proposition has no merit that is in excess of the merits of any one of three or four propositions that we included in the bill. If it goes in, others ought to go in. If others have to wait, it can wait; and I do not have to go outside of the testimony of engineers to reach that conclusion.

I am not opposed to the item going in the bill if, upon fair consideration of the whole project, it seems to us that it should go in and that others just as good should go in. It may be that I should be compelled to consent to others being thrown out; but I do not want to have my hands tied to start with when we come to consider the general question, because legislation, under our system, is not perfected until the two Houses have adopted the conference report.

I am not going into any very elaborate statement about these two projects—that is to say, the Buttermilk Channel and the so-called East River Channel. This colloquy occurred before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on the 12th of February, 1916, between Mr. BOOHER, a Member of Congress from Missouri, and Col. Black, now the Chief of Engineers:

Mr. BOOHER. Colonel, I want to ask you a question as to Document No. 44, Sixty-third Congress, first session, relative to the improvement of Buttermilk Channel. Now, you say that the other is better. Why the change?

Col. BLACK. There is no change. You will find that both projects are printed in the House documents of the Sixty-third Congress, first session. The Buttermilk Channel report is in Document No. 44, the East River report in Document No. 188. Both are important and much-used entrances to the East River. They were considered as such, reported on by different people. Both are worthy of improvement. At sometime both will be improved and it is simply a question which will be improved first.

Mr. BOOHER. Let me read you a section:

Reading now from report No. 44, in favor of the Buttermilk Channel—

"On account of the great cost of suitably enlarging the channel passing between Governors Island and the Battery—

That is, the East River project—

"and the difficulties attending the prosecution of the work in this congested part of the harbor, the district officer does not favor the enlargement of this channel, but recommends instead the improvement of the Buttermilk Channel to a depth of 40 feet at mean low water and width of 1,000 feet, believing that this route will adequately meet the needs of the Navy and be of future benefit to general commerce and navigation."

Who was the district officer that made this report?

Col. BLACK. Col. Roessler. I never did understand why that channel was given to Col. Roessler to report on and why the other was given to me to report on. There was a slip up in the chief's office. The clerk got the wrong man. Now, we two independent officers made two independent investigations. Col. Roessler got his in first and said this about the East River, but as a matter of fact, the other is cheaper.

Mr. BOOHER. Now, what caused the change from Buttermilk Channel over to the other?

Col. BLACK. Never was any change. Two independent officers make independent investigations as to which is the better, and the one comes to one conclusion and the other comes to another conclusion. Now, it is a question of your paying your money and taking your choice. Both will eventually be needed. Both will eventually be improved.

That was the only way left for him to get out of it.

Now, if those eminent engineers, in dealing with that question, differed, and the best answer that Col. Black could give to the

question as to how he was going to reconcile that conflict was to say: "You pay your money and you take your choice," since we are called upon to pay the money I think we ought to have some voice in taking the choice.

I want the Senate to act independently on this matter. The Committee on Commerce has no pride of opinion about it. We have laid the cards on the table. That is what we have done about it. I shall not feel offended if every member of the committee votes for the retention of this item. This bill has been conducted in the open. There has not been a single item in it that we do not understand everything about that it is necessary to understand. There were very complete hearings in the House of Representatives. Printed copies—bound copies—of those hearings were laid upon the desk of every member of the committee, and if each did his duty he familiarized himself with what is contained therein. There is no guesswork about it. We know what we are doing. I think the item ought to be left out, but I shall not be offended at anybody who takes a different view of it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, before any action is taken upon this item I wish to say that I shall vote to keep it in the bill. Of course, we are met instantly by the criticisms of the supporters of other items. We who believe in striking out certain items that are neither meritorious nor national in character are at once accused of inconsistency. I very much prefer to be accused of many things whether they be justly or unjustly founded than to interfere with the improvement of a harbor which leads to one of the navy yards of the country, and is at the greatest port in the New World. For that reason, if for none other, I shall support this item. I think it was stricken out without any proper foundation, and the more I have heard it discussed here the less good reason I have heard for leaving it out of the bill.

If there is any political argument advanced for omitting this improvement it would not appeal to me. It does not make any difference to me, Mr. President, whether the Chief Executive approves or disapproves. That of itself is not controlling, but the reason of his approval or disapproval ought to appeal to Senators on a matter of this kind, in which no political argument ought to control. While I admit that even a Democratic President may inadvertently be right sometimes, the mere fact that he recommended this item would not destroy its usefulness if it rested upon any sufficient foundation, and this does.

It is said in the minority report presented by the House committee that the improvement would not be undertaken before one year. I trust we will be at peace for at least one year, and even if it is indefinite, there are a great many improvements we might be compelled to make under the stress of a great emergency. If the appropriation be here allowed, at least within the year, steps will be taken for making this improvement.

New York and its harbors and all the approaches, whether on salt or fresh water, are a part of my country as much as it is of the gentlemen who reside in New York City. I feel just as much interest in any improvement there as if it were a few miles from my door. I believe the character of this improvement, its great importance in war as well as peace, the very great volume of commerce, both in merchandise and in passengers, that will have to enter this harbor annually, make it a first consideration to this body to see that all adequate appropriations are provided.

To my mind, the principal thing is stated by both Senators from New York. At this time if a portion of the Navy could not reach the Brooklyn Navy Yard because of water inadequate in depth, if in time of trouble they could neither obtain ingress nor egress or reach a dry dock for repairs, that, to my mind, answers all other objections, even those of a political character.

Whatever rule may have been passed, if we are to hamper ourselves by House rules and Senate rules that override an emergency of this kind, then it were better that no rules were made. Those rules are not made in the interest of economy. They are made solely for the purpose of cutting off appropriations in an easier way than to meet the ordinary appeals that are made by communities who desire additional expenditures. It is the easiest thing in the world when a rule of this kind has been adopted to say that we can not take up any new project under the rule.

I know how difficult it is to withstand those appeals. I know some of the difficulties that the chairman of the committee, who is primarily charged with a great responsibility in the handling of such bills as this, meets.

On every side of my State there are waterways. On the north and east is one of the Great Lakes, on the east and south there are the Wabash and Ohio Rivers, and along the entire western border of the State runs the Mississippi River,

Since I have opposed certain items in this bill, Mr. President, I have been deluged with telegrams that wish me to take even the bad in order that the good may be saved.

I had an idea once that the Senate was a proper body to make discriminating cuts; that we do not have to take the rotten with the sound in order to save the sound portions of a bill. If it has reached that bad eminence, and if parliamentary government has reached such a level that we are obliged to vote for every project, wise or unwise, that presents itself, without regard to its merits, then I am ready to vote against everything in such a bill. If economy, if proper restrictions, can not be made in any way save that meritorious projects be killed, then let the slaughter proceed, so far as I have a voice in the matter.

Sometimes it takes killing to do good. I do not think the Treasury is of more account than human life, and still military operations constantly kill so that by the destruction of human life ultimate good may come. So, if the Treasury must be protected by the killing of meritorious projects that appear from time to time, then let it be done. I must answer those appeals to me from my own country in that way.

This, however, calling for an immediate expenditure of \$200,000, is of a high type of improvement that is not local in its character. It is national in its scope. If New York Harbor should have an insufficient depth of water, if suddenly war were to be our portion, I am vitally interested in seeing that access is obtained to the navy yard, that repairs may be made, new vessels launched, and that prompt action may be had in taking out such battleships or cruisers as are necessary. It is a national question.

Of course, the criticism will be made at once, "Why are you against some other item in the bill?" Those items that have not that opposition in every instance are purely local in their operation. Some of them, it is true, are old measures; they are old in sin and expenses and little result. Most of them show that supposed improvements were instituted but the volume of commerce has fallen off. In some instances it has fallen off 75 per cent or more. So the more the improvements are the less the commerce for the community. These in every instance are local in their character, and if they were obliterated entirely from this bill, and if such improvements were to be ended, they could not affect the national welfare in the least.

The improvements of this character in tidewater rest upon an entirely different basis. I am perfectly willing to be accused of the inconsistency of being unduly susceptible to a large center, where commerce legitimately ebbs and flows, than to add my vote to keep this item out of the bill. For that reason I shall vote to restore it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I hope my colleague will withdraw the request.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. [Putting the question.] The Chair is unable to decide by the sound.

Mr. KENYON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH], who is necessarily absent. For that reason I withhold my vote.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] and withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and vote "nay."

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORF] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GRONNA. May I inquire if the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. GRONNA. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] to the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator. I transfer the pair to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART] and vote "yea."

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT], but I understand he would vote as I do, and I therefore vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. I understand he has not voted. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON];

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN];

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY].

Mr. CATRON (after having voted in the negative). I wish to inquire if the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. CATRON. I have a general pair with that Senator and withdraw my vote.

Mr. OLIVER (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. OLIVER. I have a pair with that Senator which I transfer to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] and allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—14.

Bankhead	Martin, Va.	Shafroth	Swanson
Broussard	Myers	Sheppard	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Nelson	Simmons	
Fletcher	Ransdell	Stone	

NAYS—48.

Ashurst	Hardwick	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Hitchcock	Norris	Smoot
Brady	Hughes	O'Gorman	Sterling
Brandeggee	Husting	Oliver	Thomas
Chilton	Jones	Overman	Thompson
Clapp	Kenyon	Page	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Pittman	Underwood
Curtis	Lane	Poinexter	Wadsworth
Fall	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Walsh
Gallinger	Lewis	Reed	Warren
Gronna	Lippitt	Sherman	Weeks
Harding	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	Works

NOT VOTING—34.

Borah	du Pont	McCumber	Smith, Md.
Bryan	Goff	McLean	Smith, Mich.
Burleigh	Gore	Newlands	Smith, S. C.
Catron	Hollis	Owen	Sutherland
Chamberlain	James	Penrose	Taggart
Colt	Johnson, Me.	Phelan	Townsend
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson	Williams
Cummins	Kern	Saulsbury	
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Shields	

So the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I now ask to go back to the amendment appearing on line 25, page 22, authorizing an increase of the appropriation from \$25,000 to \$50,000, that was passed over in order that we might supply a letter from the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. SMOOT. That amendment is in reference to the channel at Port Bolivar, is it not?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. It involves the channel at Port Bolivar, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 22, line 23, it is proposed to strike out the figures "\$25,000" and to insert "\$50,000," so as to read:

Channel to Port Bolivar, Tex.: For maintenance, \$50,000.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I now present the letter in reference to that amendment, and I desire the Secretary to be good enough to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, May 2, 1916.

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD,

United States Senate.

SIR: In reply to your inquiry relative to the amount needed for the maintenance of Bolivar Channel, Tex., I have the honor to inform

you that immediately upon the passage of the pending river and harbor bill by the House of Representatives copies of this bill were sent to all district officers, with request for information as to whether the bill sufficiently met the needs of the works in their districts until about April 1, 1917. In reply to this letter the district officer at Galveston reported that no additional funds were needed for Bolivar Channel; but this morning I am in receipt of a telegram from him, stating that emergency dredging in this channel since March 9 has exhausted all available funds, and that \$25,000 in addition to the amount carried in the pending bill, or a total of \$50,000 altogether, will be required if the full channel depths and dimensions are to be maintained until April 1, 1917.

Very respectfully,

H. TAYLOR,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Acting Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if he knows what class of work had been done before March 12, which necessitated the additional appropriation of \$25,000? Why was the work undertaken? The letter does not make any explanation as to the reason for doing the work. I should like to be informed, if the Senator knows, why the work was done?

Mr. SHEPPARD. An unusual shoaling was caused by the storm of a few months ago.

Mr. SMOOT. That is, the Senator means by the wash from the watershed into the river?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not a river, but it is a channel in the bay near Galveston. It is one of the main channels composing the greater Galveston Harbor, the channel leading from Bolivar Roads to Port Bolivar.

Mr. SMOOT. What has been the usual annual appropriation for maintenance of the channel to Port Bolivar?

Mr. SHEPPARD. My impression is that it has been something like \$25,000 or \$30,000.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought I had the report in reference to the matter, but I have it not before me; and I therefore can not turn to it at present. It seems to me, however, that the letter which has been read at the desk is very indefinite. There is nothing particular in it. The letter states that the necessity for the increase in the appropriation is simply on account of work that has been done there, and that for that reason they want this extra \$25,000. There is no explanation as to what was the character of the work or the necessity for it. It seems to me that information ought to have been supplied by the engineers before the increase should have been made.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will state for the information of the Senator from Utah that I shall later have the full data in reference to the storm and the effects of the storm on that channel. The necessity for this appropriation is due to the unusual storm which took place there a short time ago; but I repeat that I shall have the data as to the effect of that storm and put it in the Record as soon as I can get it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I hardly think it is necessary to further pass that item over. It is a maintenance item.

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to ask that it be passed over, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. In consequence of a storm on the coast, the channel is filled up and must be dredged out, in order that boats may get in and out. It is one of the current expenses of maintaining the channel. About all that can be said is now said in the communication from the Chief of Engineers, which has just been filed. We added some \$300,000 or \$400,000 for a similar purpose at the mouth of the Mississippi River, at the Head of the Passes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not ask that the item be passed over. I simply wanted to get some kind of explanation as to the necessity for the proposed increase, because the letter does not specifically state what was the necessity for the extra work that had been done.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think it does state that the extra expense is rendered necessary by reason of the storm.

Mr. SMOOT. If that was stated, I did not hear it. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not distinctly hear the reading, but I shall not further object to this item.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The next item passed over is on page 24, in lines 6, 7, 8, and 9.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment referred to by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, after line 5, the committee reported to insert:

Sabine-Neches Canal, Tex.: Continuing improvement, \$70,000: *Provided*, That so much of this amount as may be necessary may be expended for making a cut-off at Smiths Bluff, on Neches River.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, can we have some explanation of the necessity for that amendment, I ask the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It represents part of a project which was adopted by Congress and recommended by the engineers. The statement in reference to it is found on page 18 of House Document No. 1290, Sixty-first Congress, third session, and is included under the heading "Estimate for 25-foot channel." The project carries an estimate for "Cut-off, 70 feet bottom width." This is the cut-off authorized by the project as originally outlined, and was included in the Senate bill two years ago, but the bill failed on the floor of the Senate, as the Senator from Iowa will remember.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator know why the other House did not include this item?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I do not. I know that the Senate committee examined the item thoroughly two years ago; that it decided it was part of the original project; and that we followed that action of the committee at this time.

Mr. KENYON. Does this complete the project, I should like to ask the Senator?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will complete the project as originally outlined by the special board of engineers, except as to maintenance.

Mr. SMOOT. Has this item been recommended by the Board of Engineers for this year's appropriation?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is a part of the original project.

Mr. SMOOT. And for this amount?

Mr. SHEPPARD. This is the estimate of the engineers as to the cost of making the cut-off.

Mr. SMOOT. I have been trying to see whether there were any hearings upon the matter in the House, but I do not think there were. If there were any hearings, copies have not been sent to me. The Senator says that this \$70,000 will complete the project?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It completes the project as outlined in the report of the special board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 24, line 20, after the word "maintenance," to insert "and repair of levees destroyed by overflows in 1915 and 1916," and in line 22, after the words "Washita River, Tex.," to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$50,000," so as to make the clause read:

Red River, Ark. and Tex.: Continuing improvement and for maintenance and repair of levees destroyed by overflows in 1915 and 1916 between Fulton, Ark., and Washita River, Tex., \$50,000.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, that amendment also makes an increase from \$25,000 to \$50,000. This is one of the items on which I want to ask a vote of the Senate. I hesitate to find fault with the Red River on account of its being in the vicinity of the home of the chairman of the committee, but I want to call the attention of the Senate particularly to some of the facts, and then, so far as I am concerned, will submit the item to a vote.

I do not know as to the third branch of the amendment, the one relating to the repair of the levees. I think we had no evidence before the committee on that subject, but the word of the chairman, of course, would be persuasive. I want to place in the Record an extract from the Report of the Chief of Engineers, commencing on page 947, volume 1, as to the Red River from Fulton, Ark., to the mouth of the Washita. We have appropriated for that part of the river—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I might say to the Senator that this item has nothing to do with that part of the river south of Fulton.

Mr. KENYON. It refers to the river below Fulton?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. To the river north of Fulton.

Mr. KENYON. The item is for the Red River between Fulton and the mouth of the Washita, is it not?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. North or west of Fulton.

Mr. KENYON. I want to ask the Senator, then, relative to geography. We have two items in this bill for the Red River?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. KENYON. One from Fulton to the mouth of the Washita. That is this item, is it not?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The amended item on page 24, lines 19 to 23, covering the Red River in Arkansas and Texas, relates to the northern division, which is in the Dallas district, while that part of the river south of Fulton is in the Vicksburg district.

Mr. KENYON. That is the item that is treated in the Army Engineer's report on pages 947 to 950, volume 1, I think.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I doubt whether it is.

Mr. KENYON. The other part of the river, below Fulton, is treated on pages 953 to 956.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I should like the Senator to direct his attention to the particular item with which we are now dealing.

Mr. KENYON. That is what I am trying to do. There are two items, one involving the Red River from Fulton to the mouth of the Washita and the other below Fulton. Now, this is the one from Fulton to the mouth of the Washita, is it not?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No, sir; it is northwest from Fulton; it is what is called the upper reach of the river.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, let me say to the chairman of the committee that the Washita River referred to there is in Oklahoma. It has the same name as the river which empties into the Red River in Louisiana; but the Red River from Fulton to the Washita is the upper section. The river which empties into the Red River in Louisiana is spelled differently; it is the Ouachita; that is all.

Mr. SMOOT. Then, this is the item referred to in the report made by the Chief of Engineers, in part 2, page 866, "Red River between Fulton, Ark., and the mouth of the Washita River in Oklahoma"?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Exactly; and it will be found there that the engineers estimate that \$50,000 will be necessary for the next fiscal year.

Mr. KENYON. Let us settle, first, whether or not that is the item. The Army Engineer's reports speak of the Red River from Fulton, Ark., to the mouth of the Washita River in Oklahoma. This item on page 24 refers to the Red River between Fulton, Ark., and the Washita River, Tex. Is there any difference?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It should be the Washita River, Okla.

Mr. KENYON. So, then, I am correct, I think, in my statement. On the part of the Red River from Fulton to the mouth of the Washita River we have expended, as appears on page 950, volume 1, of the Report of the Chief of Engineers, \$444,783.53. On page 949 the report refers to commercial statistics, and says:

Navigation on the Red River above Fulton has practically ceased. No steamboats are now in operation, and the rafting of logs has been reduced to an almost negligible quantity.

On the Red River below Fulton, which this item, it is true, does not treat of, that section of the river being provided for in another part of the bill, we have expended, according to the Report of the Chief of Engineers, volume 1, page 955, \$2,763,896.40, with a commerce on the river of 47,351 short tons.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the Senator state the value of the 47,351 tons?

Mr. KENYON. They had a value of \$2,930,073. That traffic consists of lumber and logs, farm products, and general merchandise.

Now, as to the nature of that traffic, I have the minority report filed by Senator Burton in 1914, in which he discusses this improvement. I read from page 9:

On the Red River below Fulton, covering a distance of 475.4 miles, there was in the year 1912 a total tonnage of 44,967 tons—

It was slightly more the next year—

Of this amount 42,640 tons were saw logs, of which the average haul was 131 miles, and lumber 1,100 tons. Of the balance of the freight, including lumber, amounting to 2,327 tons, part was carried 45 and part 80 miles. The total amount appropriated to date for this stream is \$2,768,377—

Which includes, of course, the river above as well as below Fulton—

The expense per ton to the United States Government for carrying this freight, including the lumber, can be approximately obtained if an allowance of 4 per cent is made on the amount appropriated to date and the prospective appropriation in the pending bill is added. This interest on the investment would amount to \$110,735.08, and adding the \$100,000 appropriated, would make a total of \$210,735.08. The cost per ton would be \$4.68, or if the saw logs are excluded, the cost per ton would be \$90.56, and the cost per ton-mile, \$1.53.

I refer to these items to show that, so far as commerce is concerned, as to the particular item in question, there is no commerce, for, according to the Report of the Chief of Engineers—

Navigation on the Red River above Fulton has practically ceased. No steamboats are now in operation, and the rafting of logs has been reduced to an almost negligible quantity.

I simply raise the question, Mr. President, whether, on that kind of a showing, we are justified in increasing this appropriation. If we are going to appropriate for flood control in this bill, there may be some justification for it, but a flood-control bill, carrying some \$50,000,000, has now passed the House and is in the Senate for action before the committee. The

flood-control matters ought to be separated from questions of navigation. I do not care to further discuss this matter, but I did desire to put the facts in the Record.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the amount carried by the amendment is the amount recommended by the engineers for the present year, as appears on page 281 of the report which accompanies this bill.

As to the matter of navigation, that part of the river has fallen somewhat into disuse. Under the general authorization for resurveys, contained in the last river and harbor bill, a new survey of the river was made during last summer, and a recommendation not altogether favorable to its very extensive improvement was made; but the engineers did recommend that the project was worthy of an appropriation of \$50,000 for the purpose of keeping it in a navigable condition, or of keeping its natural navigable condition in such order that it might be used when necessary; and it is used during the so-called cotton seasons of the year. Many of the plantations in that locality can not be reached otherwise. It has lost some of its significance because of the construction of railroads running east and west from Texarkana, but it is still a river, and a navigable river, and under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. After having dealt with it, I think as strictly as could reasonably be done under the modern and reform policy now prevalent in the Engineer's office, there was enough merit left in the proposition to justify the expenditure of \$50,000.

Maj. Slattery, of the Corps of Engineers, in a communication on the subject, says, "only such snagging operations, such participation in levee building, and such levee and revetment work to prevent cut-offs as Congress may authorize" is warranted.

A very extensive scheme of improvement was originally adopted; but the policy now is to leave the river more in its natural condition, making such repairs as are necessary to prevent cut-offs. There have been three or four overflows on that river in the past two years, disastrous overflows, that practically devastated that section of the country and ruined every farmer in the Red River bottoms. They have lost their crops, and, in consequence of the breaking of the levees which protected what is called the regimen of the stream, cut-offs at various points are threatened.

I am sure the Senator from Iowa would not apply the rule so strictly as to preclude this improvement, if it is to be the policy of the Government to keep the rivers in their natural condition. There is some use for the river as a navigation proposition. There is much justification for preventing the river from doing additional damage to the farmers in the locality. They have put themselves to considerable expense—hundreds of thousands of dollars—to build those levees. They have broken in numerous places. The water has run through them and threatened cut-offs at various points. It is largely in the interest of the Government, I think, to make this very modest appropriation, and I hope it will be done.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if there is any prospect of placing the Red River and the Arkansas River in the flood-control bill?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No, sir; I should say not. They are hardly propositions of sufficient magnitude to justify such separate treatment.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, the statement of the Senator from Iowa as to the tonnage on the lower Red River ought not to go unchallenged. It is unfair to the river to select one particular year when the tonnage was unusually low and endeavor to analyze the river from that standpoint.

I have here a statement based on the tonnage transported on the river for the last 36 years. The statement shows that there was a total tonnage from 1878 to 1889 of the value of \$72,000,000, in round numbers; from 1890 to 1907 a tonnage of \$78,000,000; and from 1908 to 1913 a tonnage of about \$1,500,000, making the average value of the tonnage for the last 36 years, or from 1878 to 1913, \$4,220,000. In fact, the average yearly tonnage is much larger, when the traffic on the lower section of the lower Red is included, the section between the mouth of the Black in the lower Red and the mouth of the lower Red itself in the Mississippi. The fact that the tonnage increased in 1914 in the ratio of probably 50 per cent over 1913 shows that it varies from year to year.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I will suggest to the Senator that the engineers state, on page 955 of volume 1, that "the apparent increase"—and there seems to be an increase for the year 1915—"was caused by an error in reporting the commerce for the fiscal years 1913 and 1914." So, apparently, they account for the increase for the year 1915, which does not seem to be large, by an error in the computations for 1913 and 1914.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Be that as it may, Mr. President, it does not alter the general fact that there has been a relatively large

tonnage, on the average, during the last 30 or 40 years on that river.

Mr. SMOOT. The trouble about it is that for the last few years it is decreasing rather than increasing. The Senator from Iowa was perfectly fair in quoting the figures that he did for the year 1915, because the tonnage for 1915 is nearly double what it was in 1914, and it is larger than it was in 1913. The value for 1913 was only \$354,715, and the value for 1914 was only \$310,333, whereas the value for 1915 was \$2,939,073. In other words, there is some statement here that the increase for the year 1915, as reported by the engineers, was to correct the record that was made for the years 1913 and 1914, thus showing that the volume of commerce upon the river is not increasing, but is steadily decreasing. I think the Senator from Iowa was perfectly justified, and not only justified but was more than fair, in quoting the higher figures that he did to show the commerce upon that river.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But the average for three years is not a fair statement.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; but the average for 40 years is not a fair statement, either, particularly when the heavy traffic upon the river was when we were not appropriating for it. Now that Congress is appropriating money for the river, the commerce is decreasing instead of increasing. I think it is that class of rivers that we should eliminate from our river and harbor bills, and spend the Government's money upon rivers where there is a chance of increasing the commerce on them and benefiting the people by the increase.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator is mistaken about that. The river has been improved by the Government since 1828. In 1828 the sum of \$500,000 was expended to remove a great raft.

Mr. SMOOT. That was the original amount. I am speaking now of the appropriations that have been made for the maintenance of the river.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But the Senator says that this tonnage was carried when we were making no appropriations for the river.

Mr. SMOOT. I spoke of relatively no appropriations.

Mr. SHEPPARD. One of the largest appropriations was made in 1828.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; because that was the original appropriation that was made. There is not any question but that that was what they thought then would put the river in navigable shape; but we are appropriating \$50,000 this year for the maintenance of the river when the original appropriation was \$25,000. The House made an appropriation of \$25,000. The Senate has increased it, and added an amendment, and I suppose the amendment gives the reason why the increase is made—that is, to take care of the levees that were destroyed by floods during the years 1915 and 1916. Evidently out of the appropriation that was made for the fiscal years 1915 and 1916 in a lump sum the engineers would not allow any part of the \$20,000,000 or the \$30,000,000 that was appropriated during those years, respectively, to be applied to this river; and therefore I take it for granted that there has been nothing spent there, even in the maintenance of the river, during those two years. I will ask the Senator whether I am correct with reference to that?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That there has been nothing spent for the maintenance of the river?

Mr. SMOOT. That is, for the fiscal years 1915 and 1916.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Oh, yes; they have continued to improve the river during these years.

Mr. SMOOT. How much did they allow out of the lump-sum appropriation for rivers and harbors, we will say for the fiscal year 1914, for the maintenance of the Red River?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Fifty or seventy-five thousand dollars for the lower river and something like \$25,000 for the upper river.

Mr. SMOOT. It does not so appear in the report. That is all I know. It may be so, but it is not in the report.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have seen the Government snag boats in operation on the river, and I know that the improvement has continued. But, Mr. President, the Board of Engineers recommended that \$55,000 be appropriated for the lower river for the next three years to test out the question as to whether the commerce is really going to continue to decline. There has been a decline of commerce on the river during the last three or four years. Up to that time, however, the tonnage had averaged four or five million dollars a year in value for the last 30 or 40 years.

Mr. SMOOT. Can the Senator say why the tonnage is decreasing rather than increasing?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The machinations of the railroads have resulted in putting off the boats.

Mr. SMOOT. Just the same as they have in nearly every country in the world?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The people of Shreveport, the principal city on the river, have lately organized a barge line and subscribed fifty or a hundred thousand dollars in capital. The citizens laid this fact before the Board of Engineers when they made their special examination, and the Engineers decided to make this further recommendation and give the people a chance to continue the navigation of the river, to see if they could revive it and put it on the old basis.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the remarks made by the Senator from Texas are directed to that part of the river south of Fulton. The item that is now before the Senate relates to the part north of Fulton.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is very true; but I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that the Senator from Iowa has taken up the question of navigation on the lower river, and I was making answer to that. As to the upper river, the project has really never been given a chance. In 1909 the Engineers recommended that it be improved by snagging and dredging and jettying. Congress, however, appropriated only for snagging, and it was not until last year that the dredge boat was put on the river, and no jettying has yet been done. As a matter of fact, the project authorized by the Government has never had a fair trial on the upper river.

Mr. KENYON. We have appropriated over \$500,000, have we not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is true.

Mr. KENYON. Why has it not had a fair trial? What has become of the money?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It has been expended in snagging work.

Mr. KENYON. I do not know whether I gave the commerce for the last year. According to page 2690 of volume 2, it was 1,318 tons, of which 840 tons were lumber and 473 tons saw logs.

Mr. SHEPPARD. No one claims that there can be any extensive navigation on the upper section until this project is tried out. The project included dredging and jettying as well as snagging. It is not the fault of the upper section of the river that only snagging work has been done. It is rather the fault of Congress in not carrying out the project in its entirety.

Mr. KENYON. If we have spent \$519,000 since 1902, how does the Senator account for the fact that there is practically no commerce?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have tried to explain it to the Senator. Those expenditures have been confined to only one part of the recommended project; that is, snagging. The other two elements are just as necessary, and have not been supplied as yet by Congress.

Mr. RANSDELL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I understand we are taking up the upper Red River now. The Senator from Iowa attempted to discuss the lower Red River. I understood that he would move, at the proper time, to strike out the appropriation for the lower Red River. I wish to have something to say when that part of the river is taken up. I do not understand that it is under consideration now.

Mr. KENYON. I will say to the Senator that I was discussing them both, and I put in the RECORD from the engineer's report the appropriations for both projects and the commerce for both projects for those years.

Mr. RANSDELL. Do I understand from the Senator that he will discuss the lower Red River and move to strike out that item?

Mr. KENYON. I think so, at the proper time; yes.

Mr. RANSDELL. I simply wanted a chance to discuss that item when the Senator reached it. I have nothing further to say at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Upon that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CATRON (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (when his name was called). Mr. President, what are we doing? Is the roll being called to ascertain the presence of a quorum, or are we voting on something?

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are voting on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know whether, under the rule, I can ask to withdraw the request or not. As this item is on the upper Red River and does not apply to the lower Red River—

Mr. THOMAS. The roll call has been ordered. Let us have it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah wanted to make the statement that he was laboring under a misapprehension as to the item on which he called for a ye-a-and-nay vote. He desires to make a statement to the Chair with reference to it. I think he is entitled to do so.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not understand that after the roll call has begun any further statements can be made.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I think a statement for one purpose is permissible where it can not be made for another.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator from Utah withdraws the request, I shall renew it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the calling of the roll.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). May I ask to have the question stated?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the question.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, line 20, after the word "maintenance," it is proposed to insert "and repair of levees destroyed by overflows in 1915 and 1916."

Mr. FLETCHER. Is that a committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. FLETCHER. I vote "yea."

Mr. OVERMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as on the previous roll calls, and the same transfer, and vote "nay."

Mr. WEEKS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BECKHAM. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. As he is absent, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GRONNA. Has the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. GRONNA. I have a pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MYERS. Has the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCLEAN] voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. TAGGART], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SIMMONS (after having voted in the affirmative). I wish to inquire if the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. SIMMONS. I see he is in the Chamber, and I will allow my vote to stand.

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 10—as follows:

YEAS—41.			
Ashurst	Jones	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Bankhead	La Follette	Page	Sterling
Brandegee	Lane	Pittman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lee, Md.	Peidexter	Thompson
Chilton	Lewis	Pomerene	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Lippitt	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lodge	Shaforth	Walsh
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Williams
Hardwick	Martine, N. J.	Simmons	
Hitchcock	Myers	Smith, Ariz.	
Hollis	Nelson	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—10.			
Borah	Husting	Sherman	Works
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Smoot	
Fall	Norris	Thomas	

NOT VOTING—45.			
Beckham	Gallinger	McLean	Smith, Md.
Brady	Goff	Newlands	Stone
Broussard	Gore	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Bryan	Gronna	Overman	Taggart
Burleigh	Harding	Owen	Tillman
Catron	Hughes	Penrose	Townsend
Clapp	James	Phelan	Underwood
Colt	Johnson, Me.	Reed	Warren
Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Robinson	Weeks
Cummins	Kern	Saulsbury	
Dillingham	Len, Tenn.	Shields	
du Pont	McCumber	Smith, Ga.	

So the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

REVOLT IN IRELAND.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, we have been here now for six hours, and I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. May I ask, before that motion is put, the attention of the Senate for a few moments? I read a little story to-day that impressed me intensely. It affected me to the quick; and, with the permission of the Senate, I desire to occupy a few moments.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I withdraw the motion temporarily.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have no thought or desire to interfere with foreign Governments in the management of their domestic affairs, yet I feel that England in her effort to quell a local disturbance in the city of Dublin, Ireland, has gone rank mad and is both blind and deaf to all thoughts of humanity and civilization.

In the steps to quell a local disturbance the Government of Great Britain has descended to sheer butchery in dealing with this question.

Mr. President, we have listened for a long time to Great Britain's profuse professions of humanity, but her recent action bids me say that cant and hypocrisy still prevail there. Has it come to this, that proud and boastful England should brace up against a wall a poor, wounded cripple and then at order to riddle the helpless mortal with bullets? Shame! Shame! Yes, thrice shame!

Mr. President, I do not desire to commit my country, nor do I desire to commit any Senator, but for myself I want to be placed on record as standing aghast at this recent act of barbarism on the part of Great Britain. It seems to me humanity will rebel the world over at this recent act upon the part of this brutal and tyrannous power.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GRONNA presented the memorial of Hubert Harrington, president of the North Dakota Retail Hardware Association, remonstrating against the creation of a national chamber of agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Clinton, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of intoxicating liquors to Africa, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Long Island City, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. JONES presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to limit the freedom of the press, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 5525) to provide for the abandonment of Piney Branch Road between Allison Street and Buchanan Street NW., in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 461) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 5976) to amend an act approved May 29, 1908, entitled "An act to amend an act to authorize the Baltimore & Washington Transit Co., of Maryland, to enter the District of Columbia," approved June 8, 1896, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 460) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5539) to consolidate national forest lands, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 462) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2701) for the relief of William Walters, alias Joshua Brown, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 463) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 453. A bill to place Lieut. Col. Junius L. Powell on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier general (Rept. No. 465); and

S. 2222. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Antoine Bayard (Rept. No. 464).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 6070) granting a pension to Florence V. Handbury (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A bill (S. 6071) for the relief of the Episcopal Church of Selma, Ala.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 6072) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate the diseases and insects affecting cigar leaf tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 6073) granting the consent of Congress to George Fabyan to construct a bridge across the Fox River; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 6074) to authorize the United States Government to build a certain number of merchant-marine vessels and own the same and launch the same upon seas for interstate and international trade, and lease the same to corporations, associations, or persons upon such terms as may be equitable and just, applying the proceeds of the said lease to the payment of the obligations issued for the money to be expended in the building of the ships, and to reserve to the United States the right to convert the ships to national defense at any time when, in the opinion of the President and Secretary of the Navy, such shall be necessary; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 6075) granting a pension to John F. Roberson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 6076) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize condemnation of land for sites of public buildings, and for other purposes," approved August 1, 1888, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 6077) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish uniform standards of classification for cotton; to provide for the application, enforcement, and use of such standards in transactions in interstate and foreign commerce; to prevent deception therein; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. STONE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133) to authorize the President of the United States to convey the acknowledgments of the Government and people of the United States to various foreign Governments of the world who have participated in the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to celebrate the completion and opening of the Panama Canal, and also the four hundredth anniversary of the discovery of the Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INSPECTORS OF STEAM VESSELS.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey (by request) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5349) to amend section 4414 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the appointment of local and assistant inspectors of steam vessels, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

RECESS.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m. Friday, May 19, 1916) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, May 20, 1916, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 19, 1916.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God and our Father, whose tender mercies and loving kindness have been over us from the beginning, shaping and guiding our destiny as individuals and as a people, continue, we beseech Thee, Thy care over us; give us plentifully of Thy grace that we may do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before Thee, and so hallow Thy name in all our doings, in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 4856.

Mr. MANN. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that it is not in order to call up the conference report under the rule.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5841. An act to authorize the Perdido Bay Bridge & Ferry Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across Perdido Bay from Lillian, Baldwin County, Ala., to Cummings Point, Escambia County, Fla.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey and Mr. JONES members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of useless papers in the Department of Labor.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed bills and joint resolution of the following titles:

On May 15, 1916:

S. 4432. An act to amend section 8 of an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914; and

H. R. 3575. An act to amend section 5234 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to permit the Comptroller of the Currency to deposit upon interest the assets of insolvent national banks in other national banks of the same or of an adjacent city or town.

On May 16, 1916:

H. R. 6099. An act to amend section 72 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

On May 18, 1916:

H. R. 759. An act to provide for the removal of what is now known as the Aqueduct Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for the building of a bridge in place thereof;

H. R. 562. An act to amend the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing the postal-savings system, and for other purposes;

H. R. 10385. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, and for other purposes, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917;

S. 4603. An act to authorize the Jackson Highway Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tombigbee River at Princes Lower Landing, near Jackson, Ala.;

S. 4726. An act to permit issue by the supply departments of the Army to certain military schools and colleges; and

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to permit the issuance of medical and other supplies to the American National Red Cross for a temporary period.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3257. An act for the relief of Johnston-McCubbins Investment Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 5841. An act to authorize the Perdido Bay Bridge & Ferry Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Alabama, to construct a bridge over and across Perdido Bay from Lillian, Baldwin County, Ala., to Cummings Point, Escambia County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 746. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Capt. Daniel H. Powers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

UNITED STATES SHIPPING BOARD.

The SPEAKER. The conference report is not in order under the rule. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15455, the shipping bill, with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15455) to establish a United States shipping board for the purpose of encouraging, developing, and creating a naval auxiliary and naval reserve and a merchant marine to meet the requirements of the commerce of the United States with its Territories and possessions and with foreign countries; to regulate carriers by water engaged in the foreign and interstate commerce of the United States; and for other purposes.